THE SCIENCE OF THE SACRED WORD

BEING A SUMMARISED TRANSLATION

OF

THE PRANAVA-VADA

OF

GARGYAYANA

BY

BHAGAVAN DAS, M.A.

with notes by Annie Besant

VOL. II.

THE THEOSOPHIST OFFICE, Adyar, Madras, S., India.

1911


PRINTED BY
ANNIE BESANT
VASANTA
PRESS
ADYAR
MADRAS

For permission of translations apply to

THE THEOSOPHIST OFFICE, Adyar, Mad-

CONTENTS

[illegible]

SECTION III. (*Continued.*)

CHAPTER X.

THE UPANIṢHAṬS.

The *Upaniṣhaṭs*—Their relation to the other parts of scripture.—Their contents; the description of the forms and functions of the atoms of the various root-elements.—The number of the *Upaniṣhaṭs*.—The contents of these of the *Ṛk*.—The sub-divisions of the root-elements.—Indication of the contents of the other *Upaniṣhaṭs*.—The meaning of the word.—The special power of m a n ṭ r a s.—Why.—The dual nature of the World-process, growth and decay.—Evolution as a whole.—Minor *Upaniṣhaṭs*.

After the *Brāhmaṇas* come the *Upaniṣhaṭs*. They too are in the nature of comments on the *Veḍas*, and are constructed, and for a similar purpose, also, by the authors of the corresponding *Brāhmaṇas*, *viz.*, by the sub-hierarchs of Viṣhṇu, Brahmā and Shiva. The difference between the various parts may be described thus: In the *Veḍas* proper, the original *Samhiṭā*, such extremely general and comparatively abstract facts are dealt with as p r a k ṛ ṭ i, the essential nature of the penultimates and especially the Not-Self; v i k ṛ ṭ i; change or transformation; s a ṭ ṭ v a, being; s v a b h ā v a, Self-

nature; Self-being, the constitution (so-to-say) of the Absolute; ā v a s h y a k a ṭ ā, necessity; the birth of ā k ā s h a, and so on. In the *Brāhmaṇas*, the s ṭ h ū l a ṭ a ṭ ṭ v a s or 'large,' 'gross,' concrete, homogeneous, (so-to-say pre-atomic) elements, ā k ā s h a, v ā y u, etc., are described, generally. In the *Upanishaṭs*, the differentiation of atoms and their activities is treated of, in accordance with each *Veḍa*, in pursuance of the general principles enunciated there, and with special reference to cognition, action, desire and summation in the various permutations in which they occur.

This distinction only illustrates the general rule and order of all exposition whatsoever, *viz.*, first, the statement of the root-facts, then that of their more particular parts and branches, and thereafter of twigs and leaves and further details of them and of their behaviour and operations. The *Veḍa* is sub-divided into divisions in conformity with this method; and it is worth noting that the mere fact of such division inevitably implies that each sub-division is incomplete by itself. The *Mantra* or *Samhiṭā*, the *Brāhmaṇa*, and the *Upanishaṭ* portions are, each of them, incomplete and unintelligible without the others.

In obedience to this principle of method, the *Upanishaṭs* describe the whole work of the seven ṭ a ṭ ṭ v a s, *viz.*, m a h a ṭ, b u ḍ ḍ h i, ā k ā s h a,

etc.; their differentiation into atoms or p a r a m-ā ṇ u s; the causes and purposes thereof; the functions and uses of the atoms; and what and how many in each ṭ a ṭ ṭ v a are concerned with cognition, how many with action, or desire, or summation, how one is born from or is destroyed by another, etc. In thus expounding the work of the atoms the *Upaniṣhaṭs* expound the work of the whole of S a m s ā r a in reality, for the one obvious and manifest doer of all work in the World-process is the atom. Without it the formation of organised bodies, the vehicles of individual consciousness and experience, is impossible; hence the importance of describing them and their s ā m ā n-ā ḍ h i k a r a ṇ y a, consciousness of common purpose, synthesis, co-ordination, unification in a substrate, and v a i y-a ḍ h i-k a r a ṇ y a, analysis, differentiation, manifoldness, reference to different objects, during manifestation. In every work or activity whatever all four kinds of atoms, of cognition, of action, of desire and of the summation, are engaged constantly, however infinitesimal, even minuter than the 'atom,' the activity may be.[1] For the word

[1] Modern science is rapidly approaching these conclusions. Ernest Hækel in *The Riddle of the Universe* (translated by MacCabe) speaks of every atom possessing æsthesis, 'feeling' or 'sensation,' and tropesis, 'an active inclination.'

p a r a m-ā ṇ u, super-atom, is used here only for practical convenience and as representative of the general fact; in reality, there are layers within layers of being, subtler and grosser, in endless number and degree, each layer embodying successions, orders and methods similar to those prevailing in the denser planes with which we are more or less familiar.

As there are sixteen classes of the *Brāhmaṇas*, so are there sixteen of the *Upaniṣhaṭs* also. Thus the *Ṛg-Veḍa* has four; and their order of treatment and succession is the same too. The four portions relating to cognition are described in them (that is to say, the elements are sub-divisions of cognition comprised within each of the four, cognition, action, desire and summation).[1]

(In the *Ṛk Upaniṣhaṭs*) there are first described the causes of the formation of atoms in the m a h a ṭ and b u ḍ ḍ h i-ṭ a ṭ ṭ v a s, with refer-

[1] The text is silent on the subject, but presuming from the general symmetry of the whole scheme, we may suppose that the other three sets of four *Upaniṣhaṭs* each similarly deal, those of the *Yajuh* with the four portions of action, those of the *Sāma* with the four portions of desire, and those of the *Aṭharva* with the four portions of the summation, but all under the dominance of 'desire' and 'more detailed exposition' which is the prevailing double characteristic of the *Upaniṣhaṭ* as such.

ence to the cognition-element only; their characteristic marks and functions or activities are also stated; also, to some extent, the methods or laws which govern those activities. Thus:

There are three sub-divisions or kinds under the mahaṭ-ṭaṭṭva, (a) mahaṭ proper, (b) chiṭ, and (c) niṭ. All three are constantly intermixed in the universal (mahaṭ), and all three are always actively functioning everywhere in conjunction; none can ever stay still for a moment without performing its own proper work. The chiṭ sub-division is the cognitional atom. The work done in or by this sub-division is the work of cognition. Vyakṭi, manifestation, definition, individuation or specifications possible by means of work or activity only; and that vyakṭi itself is the atom, vyakṭi meaning the act of manifestation as well as a manifested individual.

(The sub-division of 'mahaṭ proper' constitutes the actional atom, and that of niṭ the atom of desire.[1]) The buḍḍhi-ṭaṭṭva is

[1] The text for some reason or other does not characterise the other sub-divisions of mahaṭ, *viz.*, mahaṭ proper and niṭ, as it does chiṭ. The parenthesis is added to supply this, but with some diffidence. The reason for the assumptions therein are that elsewhere in the text mahaṭ-ṭaṭṭva as a whole is said to be predominantly connected with

similarly sub-divided into (a) buḍḍhi proper, (b) chiṭṭa, and (c) manas. Of these the paramāṇu or atom formed by the chiṭṭa is described in the *Ṛg-Veḍa* (*Upāniṣhaṭs*). The summation of (the three sub-divisions of) the buḍḍhi-ṭaṭṭva is ahamkāra. So the summation (of the sub-divisions) of the mahaṭ-ṭaṭṭva is saṭṭva. In such order, then, of action, cognition, desire and summation is each atom described in the *Upaniṣhaṭs* of each *Veḍa*[1].

---

action, buḍḍhi-ṭaṭṭva in general with cognition, and ākāsha with desire; and names in this scheme of metaphysic are typical as well as proper.

[1] The text here is obviously perplexing. I have tried to be as literal as possible, following the exact order of the words where feasible and likely to be significant, as in this sentence, 'in such order, then, of action, cognition, desire and summation, etc.' The reason of the particular order of action, cognition etc. here observed is not easy to see. Apparently, what is meant is that the *Ṛg-Veḍa Upaniṣhaṭs* describe the cognition-atoms of each ṭaṭṭva particularly and the other atoms generally; those of the *Yajuh*, action-atoms particularly and the others generally; those of the *Sāma*, desire-atoms particularly and the others generally: and those of the *Aṭharva*, summation-atoms particularly and all others as subservient. And if so, one would think that the order might rather have been

In ākāsha too we have the same arrangement: (a) ākāsha proper or the desiderative element, (b) chiḍākāsha, the cognitional, and (c) mahākāsha, the actional. (d) Parākāsha is the summation.

The sub-divisions of vāyu are: (a) chiḍ-vāyu, cognitional, also called māruṭa, (b) para-vāyu, actional, also called pavana, and (c) vāyu proper, desiderative, also called vāṭa. Anuvāyu, or maruṭ is the summation.

---

cognition, action, desire and summation. Ordinarily, one might have thought that the little change in order did not mean anything particular; but all over the work, we find so much significance attaching to each particular order that it does not seem justifiable to apply a different standard in this particular place. Thus while there is no doubt as to the following correspondences:

A—Self—jñâna—guṇa—chiṭ—saṭṭva;

U—Not-Self—kriyâ—karma—saṭ—rajas;

M—Negation—ichchhâ—ḍravya—ânanḍa—ṭamas etc.; yet, the order in which they are spoken of commonly is very different, thus: jñâna,—ichchhā—kriyâ; ḍravya—guṇa—karma; saṭ—chiṭ—ânanḍa; saṭṭva—rajas—ṭamas; etc. With each change of aspect the order of succession changes more or less. The reasons for such variations are touched upon here and there in the text, though in a cursory and merely suggestive fashion; but they are sufficient to make us feel that

The sub-divisions of ṭejas are: (a) agni, cognitional, (b) ṭejas proper, desiderative, and (c) vahni, actional. Anala is the summation.

The sub-divisions of āpas are: (a) salila, cognitional, (b) āpas proper, desiderative, (c) ṭoyam, actional. Jala is the summation.

The sub-divisions of pṛṭhivī are: (a) pṛṭhivi, cognitional, (b) meḍinī, actional, and (c) mahī, connected with desire. Ḍhariṭrī is the summation.

---

liberties are not to be taken lightly with the text anywhere, however unimportant it may seem in any place. The author shows a decided reserve throughout on the subject of the two less-known elements, and more or less lumps them up together, while treating the other five distinctively, as in the present instance itself; and consequently it is difficult to form a clear idea as to some of their bearings. On this same question of order, for instance, he almost invariably mentions the mahaṭ-ṭaṭṭva first and then the buḍḍhi-ṭaṭṭva; but when the synonyms of these, *viz.*, anupāḍaka and āḍi respectively are used, then the order is reversed and āḍi is mentioned first and anupāḍaka next. The statement in the text here, that, (to translate strictly literally,) 'in the *Ṛg-veḍa* is the description of the chiṭṭa-made atom,' is even more perplexing. On the principles stated in the preceding note, and in view of other statements scattered over the book one would have thought that under the general

Such are the laws or ways of differentiation that govern all the elements. These different atoms of the different ṭ a ṭ ṭ v a s are formed by different operations. All these operations, together with their causes and principles, are described in the *Upaniṣhaṭs*; also the time when atomicity begins, how long it lasts and what modifications it undergoes. It should here be again impressed on the mind that the atoms

---

b u ḍ ḍ h i-ṭ a ṭ ṭ v a the special sub-division of (a) b u ḍ ḍ h i proper was formed of cognitional atoms, (b) m a n a s a, (not m a n a s nor m ā n a s a which are the two other words of similar sound used in the book though apparently in more or less different senses), of actional atoms and (c) c h i ṭ ṭ a, of those of desire. In the circumstances, I do not attempt to give any positive interpretation of the text here.

Towards the end of Section III, there are statements, inconsistent-seeming again, that m a n a s (not m a n a s a) is of the nature of r a j a s, *and* has the quality of desire; b u ḍ ḍ h i, of s a ṭ ṭ v a *and* ascertainment; a h a m k ā r a of ṭ a m a s *and* 'I shall *act.*' The reconciliation will probably be found in the principle of sub-divisions by reflexion. The *Viṣhṇu Bhāgavaṭa*, III. xxvi, says clearly that b u ḍ-ḍ h i has j ñ ā n a s h a k ṭ i; a h a m k ā r a, k r i y ā s h a k ṭ i; and m a n a s is 'born of k ā m a,' c h i ṭ ṭ a being aparently regarded as the summation, as in the *Yoga-Sūṭra* and *Vyāsa-Bhāṣhya* also.

born of cognition, or those connected with action or desire or the summation, do not work separately; they can work only in collaboration or combination, because of the necessity of tri-unity; and hence the treatment of them in the *Veḍas* separately as also in their combination as a fourth and all-dominating fact.[1]

---

[1] In these observations as regards the sub-divisions of elements, we may find indicated the *reason why* of the gradual evolution and multiplicity of 'elements'. The so far arbitrary and haphazard, purely empirical, list of sixty-five or seventy elements of modern Chemistry, is just beginning to receive the impress of an explanatory reason in the shape of the principle of "the diagram of the grouping of the elements, showing them as arranged on successive 'figures of eight'". (*Occult Chemistry*, by Annie Besant and C. W. Leadbeater, pp. 1-2.) It is to be hoped that in the course of time a junction will take place between the available remnants of ancient metaphyic and the growing discoveries of modern science and then the true significance and rationale of the successively three and five and seven kinds or planes of matter and then by further division and multiplication, permutation and combination, the arising of forty-nine kinds of m a r u ṭ, forty-nine kinds of a g n i, seven kinds of anatomical tissues, the ten kinds of 'vital forces' etc., will be found out. The very ways of sub-division, given as stories in the *Purāṇas*, must have some significance, awaiting

All the various kinds of paramāṇus or atoms are thus described in the sixteen *Upaniṣhaṭs* (*i.e.*, with reference to the cognition-element mainly in those of the *Rk*, to the action-element in those of the *Yajuh*, to the desire-element in those of the *Sāma*, and to the summation-element in those of the *Atharva*). Of and by them are all minerals, vegetables, animals, humans, superhumans, and the various 'earths' or globes, composed, nourished and maintained.

Upa is near, and niṣhaṭ is doing, making, bringing; that which brings the World-process near, brings it home, to every one—that is *Upaniṣhaṭ*. It, together with the *Brāhmaṇa* is called the *Shruṭi*, the *Veda* (or *Samhiṭā*) alone being called the *Manṭra*. Shruṭi means hearing. Of course, in the literal sense all sounds whatever are shruṭi; but technically only that is so-called wherein is heard the

---

discovery by the earnest student. Thus the forty-nine 'airs' arise by simple sub-division; Indra (Ruler of ākāsha and the vajra force) cuts one embryo into seven pieces, and each of these again into seven. The forty-nine 'fires' grow, on the other hand, by marriages and progenition. There are ten Varuṇas, twenty-six Kuberas, three hundred and sixty Prabhāsas—and so on. (See *Bhaviṣhya-Purāṇa*, III. xviii). All these require interpretation, in many different ways, each correct.

method of s ṛ ṣ h t i, creation in all its details; and such description is to be found only in the *Brāhmaṇas* and the *Upanishaṭs*. Similarly, the *Samhiṭā* is called the *Manṭra* because therein all things, *i.e.*, the basic principles of the universe, are pondered or reflected on (from m a n, to think), or again because it is 'protected, ṭ r ā ṭ a, by the M or Negation,' which is the connecting link between A and U and on which therefore all the procession of the world depends. The special reason why a particular collocation of sounds becomes a m a n ṭ r a in the special and technical sense, *i.e.*, a 'word of power,' a 'magic chant or incantation,' consists in the special order or arrangement of the sounds. A special power resides in sound, and a special arrangement of sounds evolves a special form of that power, whereby special work can be accomplished in the world, as may be learnt from the *Aṅga* of *Chhanḍah*, metre or music.[1]

---

[1] These observations would apparently hold good of all sense-qualities and not only of sound. Because present humanity has developed only one organ, *viz.*, the vocal apparatus, for *reproducing* a sense-quality,—while it has senses *cognising* five, evolved in different degrees,—therefore prominence is everywhere given to sound and its powers, the influence of music, etc. The rationale of sounds (or other sense-qualities) creating substantial objects, as in the classical story, familiar to western

As regards the nature of the World-process described in these scriptures, it may be said generally to be one of progress or growth, v a r ḍ h a n a or v ṛ ḍ ḍ h i. It is true that an opposite process of decay or k ṣ h a y a is also noticeable and surely exists, but that is 'nothing' and exists only for the sake of, or as a means to, growth (in the same way as the Not-Self is a means to the self-realisation of the Self). We have seen before that p r a l a y a takes place for a fresh accumulation of s h a k ṭ i or energy; and k ṣ h a y a is only another name for p r a l a y a and has the same purpose.[1]

readers, of the walls of Troy having been created by music, appears to lie in the fact that sense-qualities are inseparable from the substances to which they belong, the subtrates in which they inhere. To utter sounds is to build in ākāsha with the vocal apparatus, in the same way as to arrange tacts (touches) is to build in earth with the hands.

[1] In modern language, the storing up of energy in new compounds or tissues is possible only by and after the disintegration and destruction of old compounds or tissues—another aspect of the *negative* nature of S h a k ṭ i. [The construction of a compound is accompanied with a great disappearance of energy, and this disappearance means that the energy is stored up in the compound; it has become latent. When the compound is resolved into its component parts, this energy is liberated and

Viewing the World-process thus, we find that everything, the store of knowledge of every one, increases and expands every moment and continuously; that every one is ever climbing higher and higher, and not descending lower. This is the inevitable consequence of the operation of the law of prasāraṇa, expansion. It is true that in laya (which also inevitably takes place in consequence of the complementary law of ākuñchana or contraction,) all things are reduced to a common unity (so that higher and lower disappear); yet that unity also refers (backwards as well as forwards) to a separateness. After every pralaya, when sṛṣhti begins again, every one, whatever the stage and condition at which he went into pralaya, takes up work anew precisely there where he left off, and goes forwards again therefrom. Our daily life illustrates this; a man goes to sleep for the night after having performed a certain piece of work in the previous day; when he wakes up again next morning, he does not do that same work over again, but takes up either

---

becomes available for the building up of new compounds. Hence 'death' is necessary for a new birth, pralaya for a new manvantara. For illustration of the amount of energy set free by the dissolution of an atom, see *Theosophy in relation to Human Life*, Lecture on Science. (A.B.)]

the unfinished remainder of it or another piece of work altogether. So, too, when a jīva has gained all the knowledge and exhausted all the experiences possible, of all the facts of one world-system, then the ruler of that system sends the jīva on into another system; 'Your work here is finished, go into another world'.[1] For, we must bear in mind, all these brahmāndas and cosmic systems are all of them graded by the law of relativity into an endless chain and series of greater and smaller, lower and higher; and because this gradation is endless therefore there never can be at any time or place a final completion of the work of evolution and world-progress. The nniversal rule therefore is that when a brahmānda exhausts its energy, it goes into pralaya, and every one belonging to that system goes into pralaya also, and at that same stage that he may be in when the general pralaya of the world-system sets in; and, as said before, begins from that stage anew at the dawn of the next cycle of

---

[1] This is just as students are promoted from class to class in a school. Analogy reigns throughout, on all planes, on all scales. In illustration of this law we have the fact stated in *The Secret Doctrine* that the *nirvāṇīs* of the Lunar chain become the Jīvas of the Terrene chain, and so on, chain after chain, world-system after world-system.

activity. The aṇus or atoms (of any world-system) are not fixed or determined, niyaṭa, (in size, or indivisible and permanent); they also are born (and die). Therefore we see only progress in the universe and never regress. It is true that we are told now and then that the jīva grows by knowledge and may thus, by expansion of consciousness, pass beyond Mahā-Vishṇu even, and so, on the other hand, by decrease of knowledge, limitation of consciousness, it may redescend to the state of an atom; but, in reality, Mahā-Vishṇu, or the essence of Mahā-Vishṇu, does not contract in knowledge, because jñāna is Āṭmā and Āṭmā is indivisible, unbreakable, all-pervading, perfect. What is meant is this, *viz.*, the jīva grows by the growth of knowledge, but from the standpoint of decay, smallness is present everywhere and in everything, by comparison with things greater. From this standpoint indeed everything is equally great as well as small. In this sense smallness may well be ascribed to Mahā-Vishṇu, and hence is it declared that 'although there is a constant progress, there is a constant regress also'. Thus we conclude that there is progress only in the world.[1] The evidence of

[1] The reader must have noticed the apparent perplexity of the argument here. One feels that the author is unwilling to speak out his mind, clearly,

this is the very work of 'becoming,' which is itself p r a k ṛ ṭ i. If decay and loss were also facts (in the positive sense, and not merely in the negative sense, if they were of the nature of

---

as it were. To the careful and sympathetic reader there is of course no mistaking his meaning. He even says plainly that there *is* a return from m u k ṭ i into b a n ḍ h a n a, that there is a contraction of Mahā-Vishṇu into an atom, as surely as there is the converse process. But while everyone is glad and even eager to believe in the reality of this converse process, *i.e.*, in our emergence as individuals from bondage into unchecked and unlimited freedom, in the expansion of our individual consciousness into the glories of the consciousness of a solar logos at the very least, we are all naturally loth to entertain, even as a possibility, the fall from freedom back into bondage, the descent from a gloriously divine condition into the crawling and creeping or even stone-bound limitations of the lower kingdoms; our sentiment is hurt, our desire feels frustrated; we, *i.e.*, our lower mind, our egoism and egotism, our almost unconquerable individualism, desirous of a *separate* greatness as *compared* with others and not the *Absolute* greatness of the Changeless Whole, cannot readily believe whatever we do not like, and insist and persist in believing what we do like; 'the wish is father to the thought'.

It is more than likely that the saintly sage Gārgyāyaṇa has hesitated to state the bare truth

being or the Self rather than of non-being or the Not-Self), then the work of Prakṛṭi (from the standpoint of Prakṛṭi) would become purposeless, devoid of goal and motive and

---

here plainly and somewhat disguised the actual fact in tangled statements, stating it and then trying to explain it away, reaffirming it and again softening it down by giving a new turn to it—only out of respect for this sentiment, out of a desire not to hurt the feelings of a reader who may casually take up the work for mere curiosity, out of a tender wish not to cause even a passing spasm of despair to the earnest but not yet sufficiently strong and self-contained one. But to the student who is at the stage where happiness is in the Changeless One only, who sees that expansion and contraction are interdependent, a single inseparable pair of relatives, each involving the other and unable to exist without it, to him the bare fact is far more satisfactory, and for him it is not very deeply disguised in the work. He sees clearly, as said in the text, that kṣhaya corresponds to 'no-thing' and' vṛḍḍhi to 'be-ing,' *and* that both are necessary. The sage who leaves one body at a hundred years, in order to become a greater sage after another hundred years in a new body, has to be born again into a new body and pass through a 'deeper' ignorance and innocence and infancy. As Sāḍī, the Persian poet said: "The chick begins to peck and earn its livelihood as soon as it breaks its egg-shell, but it remains a fowl all its life. The

therefore useless. (From the standpoint of the Absolute of course there is no motive needed, for there is no change at all; but from the standpoint of P r a k ṛ ṭ i, whose very heart is limit-

---

child of man remains helpless for twenty years but becomes a *man*". The chick, by much progress *and* regress, becomes the man. As pointed out throughout *The Science of the Emotions*, (2nd edition) especially in the footnotes at p. 2 and p. 245, the human soul *cannot* comprehend the Whole Truth, of ṇ i v ṛ ṭ ṭ i as well as p r a v ṛ ṭ ṭ i, till it has itself passed from the latter to the former; the *ethical* change in the spirit, the whole being, of the man, is indispensable to and inseparable from the corresponding *cognitional* and *practical* changes. See the (*Viṣhṇu-Bhāgavaṭa*, VII. xv. 62 *et seq*. for the concomitance of ḍ r a v y â-ḍ v a i ṭ a, b h â v â ḍ v a i ṭ a and k r i y â ḍ v a i ṭ a). After v a i r â g y a the j ī v a sees that even as the whole of the World-process *is* the sheathing of the Praṭyagâṭmâ, even so is a world-system, with all its details, its stones and rocks, its reptiles and worms, its animals and men, its gods and its ṛ ṣ h i s, identified with, *actually is* part of the life and the form of, its Logos or Īshvara. *Our* life *is* in our nails and hairs and all the constituents of the body, some of which we think of with little liking or even with disgust while we are under the dominance of the spirit of 'invidious distinctions' and 'separateness'. So, the sun is the *visible* physical heart of our Logos, p r a ṭ y a k ṣ h a-ḍ e v a ṭ â

ation and change, a 'purpose,' reason, motive, aim, is needed at every step to justify the change, and this is supplied by the idea of a constant progress towards the encompassing of

---

(—*because* visible, therefore thoughtlessly not revered on the principle of 'familiarity,') and the planets, and atmospheres, and *we* and all the mineral, vegetable and animal kingdoms *are* part and parcel of His 'Glorious Body'—Ḍivya-Vigraha—as He of a still Greater One, and so on endlessly. But to understand and realise this without a pang, nay, with an all-filling joy—the soul must have passed *through* that quintessence of all pangs, the vairâgya of utter isolation, must have passed from utmost lone-li-ness to Oneness, from avīchi, the terrible weight of a waveless ocean, to kaivalya, the peace of a stirless sea. Then only does the jīva solve the problem of 'personality'—now concentrated into an all-else-resisting adamantine point when identified intensely with an atom of Not-Self, and now dissolved into an all-embracing 'emptiness of space,' excluding or repelling none, when identified with the Self; now dreading annihilation so intensely that it struggles madly to seize immortality with the help of the philosopher's stone, and now, when it has found it, desiring equally intensely to cease from the individual life wherein is only selfishness.

I have so far, in this paragraph of the text, reproduced the author's statements without adding any explanatory parentheses or making any alterations, just to give the reader an idea of the hesita-

the totality of details in *individual* consciousness; though, in very truth, such encompassing is not possible at any point of time or space by any limited individual consciousness, and there-

---

tions of the author. But from this point onwards I will make such additions more freely, in order to bring out the real meaning of the author, as I understand it to be, in view of the rest of the work.

One point is worthy of special note here, the statement that atoms are not fixed and indivisible, but are born and die for each world-system. This is characteristic and necessarily follows from the metaphysic here expounded. The essential characteristic of the Not-Self is manyness and *appearance* or *false existence*, absence of *real* definiteness but *appearance* of definiteness on a basis of indefiniteness; hence the many-atom is necessarily definite only within *a* cycle, *a* system, *a* plane, and so on. In reality there is no finality to it; it will be always breakable into corpuscles, electrons, ions and 'super-atoms,' and these again, endlessly, plane within plane. The 'permanent' atom of theosophical literature means that just as a man's physical body is permanent through any number of changes of houses he may make in his lifetime, so some one physical atom is permanent through all the changes that physical body may undergo, the jīva being primarily connected with this one physical atom out of all that go to make up the physical body; so, again, one astral atom would be permanent throughout all the changes of

fore is always only an endless endeavour, an ever-receding, an ever more and more glorious goal.)

It is true that certain sins are declared to result in rebirth into lower kingdoms. (These statements are to be interpreted in two ways. One is literal.) The chief of these sins is the slaying of the brāhmaṇa; this means the slaying of one who knows Brahman, that is to say, it means the injuring of Brahman, of one's own higher Self, the denial of it and of all law and order; it is the unreserved surrender of the Self to the senses. (Because of such suppres-

---

the astral body; and so on, indefinitely. (See Annie Besant's *A Study in Consciousness.*) (As to whether each successive permanent atom, astral, mental, etc., is or is not one out of those that constitute the next denser permanent atom of the grosser plane, requires further clarification). What the relations are to each other of the several permanent atoms (a conglomerate of which seems to make up the 'ultimate' sheath of a jīva—the expression jīva-kosha appears in the *Vishṇu-Bhāgavaṭa*—for a given cycle and system embracing the planes to which those atoms belong severally)—this may be worked out, perhaps, from the relation of the various sharīras or kōshas to each other. The Samskṛṭ way of describing the matter seems to be that the *jīva* passes from body to body, accompanied by the sūkṣhma-bhūṭas (*Vedānṭa*); or the chiṭṭa, by the indriyas (*Yoga*).

sion of the higher self, exceptional individuals may, during the actual general evolutionary progress of a race, be thrown back into lower kingdoms temporarily. This is the literal interpretation. The other is a symbolical one.) All conditions are present in the human stage, all kinds and shades of life, vile as well as noble. And ordinarily when it is said that a jīva, for instance, becomes a worm, what is meant is that he is born into certain very mean and grovelling conditions of human life.[1]

---

[1] The Theosophical doctrines and Purāṇic statements on the subject should be studied together with these statements. They supply a good commentary on these 'general rules'. The arrival of 'the divine solar and lunar kings' on this earth, with 'solar piṭṛs' and 'lunar piṭṛs' and five other classes, lunar nirvāṇīs beginning further evolution anew on earth, etc., will all acquire a clearer meaning in the light of the statements contained in the text.

The more familiar, the 'homelier,' the illustration, the better it serves its true purpose. To understand this idea of a new globe being peopled by jīvas from other and older globes, we may look at the United States of America, peopled by emigrants from a score of the older nations, and developing variations of physical, mental, moral, social, linguistic, political, religious and other characteristics under the same general idea of

The one purpose of all the *Upanishaṭs* is to make clear this fact that in all this samsāra every paramāṇu rises steadily to the status of Mahā-Vishṇu by evolution. They establish clearly that even as the many sons of one father themselves attain in turn to the condition of paternity, so every atom formed by Mahā-Vishṇu ought to attain to his estate. And as subservient to this general purpose of evolution which they describe, the *Upanishaṭs* also teach

---

'civilisation.' It is such endless variations of detail under the universal law of the Logion, that make up the 'pastime,' the 'time-filling' and the 'space-filling', of the endless universe, and explain the meaning of nirvāṇīs beginning evolution anew over and over again. The scientific hypothesis of the origin of life upon earth by the transfer of micro-organisms from other globes, in primeval times, may also be considered in this connexion.

One point may be noted more particularly. Ordinarily, the staying behind or the rebirth into a lower kingdom of a jīva is no more hard to understand than the non-promotion to a higher class, after the annual examination, or even his degradation to a lower class, of a student, in an ordinary school, who falls into the mortal sins of laziness, carelessness, and slovenly and unintelligent habits. It is notorious that the last case, of positive degradation, is very infrequent; so too is the rebirth of a jīva into a lower kingdom. The

the ḍharma, the ethical duties, which are the means thereto.

Only sixteen *Upanishaṭs* have been mentioned so far, because they are the chief, and are alone entitled to the name of *Shruṭi*, being the utterance of Vishṇu, Brahmā, Shiva (and Mahā-Vishṇu.) But later on, one hundred and eight other *Upanishaṭs* were compiled by brāhmaṇas for the instruction of the world, according to the needs of the times. These compilers

---

formidable statements in the books are largely deterrent only. Current Penal Codes prescribe seven years and ten years and lifelong imprisonment for thefts and burglaries, etc., though it is only a very, very small percentage of cases in which these heavier sentences have to be resorted to.

In the earlier stages of our humanity, the ebb and flow between the animal and human kingdoms was not infrequent, as even to-day between certain low forms of vegetable and animal life in the ocean; but with the ever-widening gulf between them, due to the more rapid evolution of the human kingdom, cases of reversion have become more rare. It must be clearly understood, however, that the consciousness, having unfolded into the human stage, cannot again revert to the stage of the animal, any more than the flower can rebecome a bud; but where the kāmic properties are very largely developed and dominate the intellectual and emotional, it may happen that the human jīva, on its

were the subordinate rulers of the system and had the necessary authority, and moreover constructed their scriptures in strict accordance with, and in pursuance of the method of, and in expansion and exposition of the same subjects as those of, the original *Upaniṣhaṭs*, whence their works also came to be called by the same name. Finally, we have another set of two hundred and fifty *Upaniṣhaṭs* framed by ṛṣhis. These one hundred and eight, and again two

---

way to reincarnation, may be temporarily attached by its animalised astral to the astral body of an animal, and hence to its physical body also, being then held in bondage, bound to an animal form as a prisoner, until it has thus worked off sufficient of these passions to render incarnation in a human form again possible. The consciousness remains human, and herein lies the suffering of such a condition, the suffering being due to the constant frustration of the efforts for human expression through an inadequate organism. For a purely physical-plane illustration, we may imagine the case of an otherwise refined and cultured 'degenerate,' with an occasional mania for torturing animals, being forcibly apprenticed to a butcher, till he is surfeited with horror.

But, after all this is understood, there may still be felt by some, a certain amount of mysteriousness attaching to the process, on our earth and in our particular evolution, of a higher jīva being

hundred and fifty, *Upanishats* should be regarded as commentaries on the original sixteen—not in the way of repetitions or interpretations of the mere *words* used there, but in the way of analyses and abstracts and expansions, for the sake of assistance in the study of the orignial. The stamp, the marks of their *Veḍa*-mūlaṭā, their '*source in the Veḍà*,' appear on the face of the sixteen chief *Brāhmaṇas* and *Upaniṣhaṭs*. Exact methods for the determination of these marks are to be found in the *Aṅgas*.

---

connected with the body of a lower animal. This last remaining mystery is perhaps due to the special fact that on our earth particularly, as one variation out of the endless modes of manifestation, jīvas from other globes *took up* bodies developed on this by *other jīvas*, in the Third Race, as a person may get a house built by others instead of raising a cottage himself—which is the normal and natural process at the primitive and elementary stages of life before complex organisation and division of labor supervene. This special 'accident' probably may help to explain statements about 'the nameless, eighth region' or Avīchi, the second death, the breaking away of the higher self and the vitalisation of the lower, etc. The breaking away means either going into pralaya or 'sleep,' or, if it is a degradation or case of vampirism, then it means a subjugation to new and lower conditions, as of an honest citizen gradually becoming an

But throughout our studies of the *Upaniṣhaṭs*, with their descriptions of endless progress and evolution, we must not forget that the Āṭmā is without growth and evolution, ever eternally fixed in its own nature, Saṭ-chiḍ-ānanḍa:

Not by the *Veḍa*, nor the crown thereof
Which is the 'end of knowledge,' high *Veḍānṭ'*,
May this Supremest Self be compassed round!
It is the Thought that ever flows with help,
It is the order of the world as Being,
It is the bringer of the endless Bliss,
Pure Being and pure Bliss and Consciousness,
Free of all bonds, an endless ecstacy!
Not all the *Veḍas*, nor the *Brāhmaṇas*,
Nor *Katha*, nor *Chhānḍogya*, nor the *Īsh'*,
Nor *Aiṭareya*, *Taiṭṭirīya*, *Kēn'*,
Nor *Prashna Upaniṣhaṭ* grasps Its greatness,
Not the *Jābāla*, nor *Āraṇyaka*,[1]

---

associate of robbers. The vitalisation of the lower, when the higher has broken away, means the coming into possession, by another thief, of the property of an honest man who has been turned away on becoming a thief; and so on. Each of such matters has many aspects, all of which should be examined and reconciled by the careful student.

[1] The names of 108 *Upaniṣhaṭs* are known currently; but ten are regarded as the chief and most studied: *Īsha*, *Kena*, *Katha*, *Prashna*, *Muṇda*, *Māṇdūkya*, *Taiṭṭirīya*, *Aiṭareya*, *Chhānḍogya* and *Bṛhaḍāraṇyaka*.

Describe adequately that boundless Being—
Alone the 'I—This—Not,' the 'I—this—Not,'
Alike on every side, changing Unchanged!

CHAPTER X

THE UPA-VEDAS

atoms they vest the properties and powers that it is necessary to manifest there. Power, force, energy, manifests everywhere; but only and always through and by means of corresponding and appropriate atoms. All workers are provided with atoms in accordance with their work or function. Hence the statement that jīvas get only what they deserve by their karma. Brightness, clearness or dimness, of physical or mental or other complexion comes to jīvas under the same law. And it is all the work of atoms. It is literally true that every jīva receives an organism in strict accordance with his karma.

The principle at work here may be expounded thus: All 'becoming' whatsoever, every event in the World-process, tiniest or most enormous, is brought about by the Universal Necessity of the Absolute Nature, Sva-bhāva. The jīva that does not recognise this fact (while on the pravṛṭṭi-path) harbours the belief that itself is the *cause* of the actions of which in reality it is only an *instrument*, a tool. It thinks, 'this act is *mine*, it is produced by *my* effort'. (And therefore it becomes bound, that is, liable to consequences in the same self-referring and ethical sense). It is true that such performance of action (in the causative sense) by an individual self is impossible, yet the superimposition

of such a belief on the action is itself 'performance by him' (for the practical purposes of *the equally illusory* attachment of ethical consequence, reward and punishment, to such *apparent* performance). In the midst of all-universality and, collectivity to *imagine* and feel individuality or singularity, as expressed by words in the singular number, 'I,' 'mine,' etc.—this is vi-kāra, perversion, 'ill-doing,' an 'evil change'. To realise Another, on the other hand (*i.e.*, recognise everywhere only the working of the Supreme Sva-bhāva, the Collective Whole as the one and only cause, Another[1] than, yet including, any and all individual self and selves)—this is good and true. By 'perverse' actions, the body is deformed; by good ones re-formed.

In the construction of the body, atoms are employed in successive order, of first, second, third and fourth, in the order of cognition, action, desire and summation. The respect in which the jiva needs cognition, for the due reaping of his karma—in that respect, and according to its karma, a cognition-atom is employed. And so as regards action, etc., also. If it be that

---

[1] The word, 'Another', seems to be used here for the One Self, for the purpose of bringing out the fact that, in one aspect, the One Universal Self is *not* many and separate selves, is opposed to them, abolishes them as separate.

the karma that brings knowledge was abundant, but not so the karma that brings the corresponding atoms, then these atoms are not supplied (by the agents of the Lords of Karma that build up human bodies) to the cognition-organs, marma, 'vital parts' or nerve-ganglia, so that these remain defective; and the result is that while knowledge is reached it remains latent; it cannot be definitely grasped and utilised because the necessary atoms are wanting[1].

[1] This may mean one of two things, either that the knowledge remains vague, undefined, almost sub-conscious, so to say, or that the person possesses it himself but cannot impart it to others or otherwise utilise it. The difference here is one of degree only, it may be added. Another way of describing the situation is that in such a case the true mental organ, the mental body, is highly developed and functioning on its own plane, but the necessary organ for physical manifestation of knowledge, the brain and nervous system, are ill-developed or even defective. The peculiar karma which would bring about such a state of things would probably consist in a persistent desire or search for the knowledge, for itself, without any desire or effort to help others with it. This would naturally result in the knowledge, when acquired, remaining overmuch 'self-confined,' and inapplicable for forming beneficent relations with others.

The case is the same with action. Thus, it often happens that the ability actually to perform work is absent, for the necessary atoms are wanting; but that activity which is of the nature of desire to manifest and realise oneself is extreme; there is desire to do everything but not power to do anything.

(So, again, we sometimes find knowledge and power of action present but an extreme lack of interest, of ambition or wish to do anything.)

The underlying principle is this : Karma is threefold. One is the universal, (or all-round) as *e.g.*, that which includes, combines and sums up knowledge, the power (*i.e.*, knowledge of the various applications) of that knowledge, and the power of employing and utilising that knowledge, (corresponding respectively to cognition, action and desire). The second kind is that wherein there is (or which brings) only the desire to do but not the power. In the third kind there is the power to do but not the wish. There are further sub-divisions of these also.

Karma is only one's own previous ideation. As the ideation of any particular jīva is, so is its karma. And as the karma is, so is the body, the knowledge, etc. Good karma brings beauty of form; evil karma ugliness. From all this it may be inferred that according to the nature of the atoms employed anywhere is the

nature of the work done there. Hence the statement that all the universe follows or is founded on the atom. And therefore are all kinds of atoms described in the *Upanishaṭs* and all their combinations in the *Upa-Veḍas*.

The *Upa-Veḍas* also are ā r c h i ṭ a. That is ā r c h i ṭ a which is compiled, constructed or revealed by an ā r c h a ; and the ā r c h a is he who is the ruler of all things and the lord and guide of all succession and evolution in a system. All Vaiḍika or scriptural works are therefore ā r c h i ṭ a.[1]

As said before, the method of treatment of all subjects in the *Upa-Veḍa* is the summational or all-comprehensive. For instance, when dealing with ḍ h ā ṭ u or minerals, the *Upa-Veḍa* will say: It is formed of such p a r a m ā ṇ u s, super-atoms; there are so many p a r a m ā ṇ u s in it, and so many a ṇ u s, atoms, molecules, particles ; the succession or order of arrangement or mutual position of them is such ; it has the power to do such and such work with them ; this power lasts in it for such a period ; minerals having such and such powers and such and such atomic or molecular constitutions are named thus and thus ; they occupy such and such positions with

---

[1] Compare the English word, in arch-angel, arch-bishop, etc. In modern Samskṛṭ we find the word ā r c h i k a, 'relating to ṛk or ṛ c h ā,' 'scriptural.'

reference to each other, and are graded in order thus, as first, second, third, fourth; and so on. All the various kinds of minerals and their ā b h ā s a, artificial imitations, appearances, reflexions (?), are described therein, m a ṇ i (crystals), r a ṭ n a (gems), s v a r ṇ a (gold), ṭ ā m r a (copper) etc., in an endless variety, of subtler than the subtlest and grosser than the grossest.

So with the vegetable kingdom, v ṛ k ṣ h a: how plants are evolved out of minerals, what their order of development of the various species is, the causes thereof, the number and kind of atoms employed in their building, the constructive arrangement of the powers and functions of these atoms, the time-limits of those vitalising powers, and so forth.

The evolution of animals, p a s h u, out of plants, and of humans, m ā n a v a, out of animals, and the gradual birth and growth in men, of intelligence and discrimination, are all similarly dealt with.

These four kingdoms, u p ā ḍ h i s, enveloping sheaths, are mentioned here as principally indicative. As a matter of fact there are endless kingdoms and evolutions, subtler and grosser, beyond and behind these. There are 'subtle' or astral formations amongst the minerals also, for instance. Indeed the whole detail may not be compassed by any one individual mind. But

the principal features and laws may be learnt from the *Upa-Veḍas*[1] which are the storehouse of all sciences, v i ḍ y ā, knowledge, and which

---

[1] The names of the principal *Upa-Veḍas* as mentioned by Paṇdiṭ Ḍhanarāja may be found in the list given in the Preface.

The *Āyur-veḍa*, meaning 'the science of *Life*, ā y u,' now identified with medicine, probably included a description of the evolution of all things whatsoever of heaven and earth—*with special reference to their subservience to the life of the human organism.* It is this reference which, probably, with the lapse of time and loss of fuller knowledge, became exaggerated and gradually reduced what was 'the sum-total of knowledge' to only 'medical science'. Even modern *Vaiḍyaka*, 'medical science,' says that all things whatsoever are a u ṣ h a ḍ h i, medicines. The name v a i ḍ y a k a, etymologically, the same as v e ḍ a, is significant; and it should be remembered that even in the West, some of the most important sciences, physiology, anatomy, botany, organic chemistry, etc., largely find their raison d'etre in pathology and 'materia medica'. *Āyur-veḍa* is said to belong to the *Ṛg-veḍa*, as being mainly cognitional.

The *Ḍhanur-veḍa*, which perhaps included all departments of government and administration, is now mostly thought of as identical with the science and art of war, and therein too, chiefly of archery. This corresponds with the *Yajuh*, or action.

are also known as the *Ṭanṭra,* because they sum up, ṭ a n ṭ r a ṭ e, all within themselves.

The *Gānḍharva Upa-veḍa*, corresponding to the *Sāma* and desire, seems to have dealt with all kinds of æsthetics and arts, and not only music, with which it is now almost exclusively identified. *Kāma-Shasṭra*, the science of love, in all likelihood formed a part of this.

The fourth or the *Kāraṇyopaveḍa* (the very name is now no longer known) belonging to the *Aṭharva* appears to have included all departments of human life within its purview, domestic, social, economical and political, with their endless sub-divisions. Current tradition substitutes for this name, that of *Sṭhāpaṭya-Veḍa*, the *Veḍa* of 'house-master-ship' or *Shilpa-Veḍa*, the *Veḍa* of constructive arts, like architecture, sculpture, painting, etc., *i.e.*, almost all arts and industries, excepting the musical.

SECTION III. (*Continued.*)

CHAPTER XII.

THE SHĀKHĀS OF THE VEḌAS.

The *Shākhās*, 'branches,' or appendices of the *Veḍa*.—The *Kṛṣhṇa* and *Shukla*, or 'black' and 'white,' sub-divisions of Scripture.—The *Shākhās* as links between them.—Light-atoms and dark-atoms.—The number of *Shākhās* of each *Veḍa*.—The *Yanṭra-shāsṭra*.—The completion of Scripture proper.

Each of these four, *Veḍa*, *Brāhmaṇa*, *Upa-nishaṭ* and *Upa-veḍa*, has two divisions known as the *Kṛṣhṇa* or black and the *Shukla* or white. The black comes first in order. It corresponds to the U. The next in order, *i.e.*, the white, corresponds to A. The *Kṛṣhṇa-Veḍa* expounds ṭamas or darkness; the *Shukla*, prakāsha or light.

The distinction of these two, light and darkness, is well-known. It is true that in reality there is no distinction or separateness between them, (for not only can neither be defined without reference to the other, but the words and facts are purely comparative also, so that what is light to one is dark to another, and *vice versa*); still, the duality is also a practical and unavoidably necessary fact. Each has an actual existence

from the standpoint of the other, though the reality is that which transcends them both.

All over Samsāra we have this dual and joint rule of light and darkness; the former dwelling in the A and the latter in the U, while M is beyond them both.

The result is that we have a *Black Ṛk* and a *White Ṛk*, a *Black Yajuh* and a *White Yajuh*, and so on with the *Sāma*, the *Aṭharva*, the *Brāhmaṇas*, the *Upaniṣhaṭs* and the *Upa-veḍas*.

The dark-aspect and the light-aspect of each ṭ a ṭ ṭ v a or element are described respectively in the black and the white sub-divisions. The formation of atoms follows the same order; such and such atoms are concerned with light, such with darkness.

Now the *Shākhās* deal with the relation between the two (the dark-atoms and the light atoms, or the *Black-Veḍas* and the *White-Veḍas* generally?); indeed the idea of the Negation, the nexus, governs their treatment of everything, and they expound the combinations and dissociations of each atom of the whole of s a m s ā r a; as that such and such a dark-atom is related to such and such a light-atom, such and such light or dark-atoms are employed or required in such and such circumstances, etc.

Dark-atoms, or 'darkness-atoms,' have the function of n a i r b a l y a, absence of force, weakness,

disappearance of energy; light-atoms, on the other hand, possess p r ā b a l y a, presence of force, strength, they produce or evolve energy. Cognition corresponds to light-atoms, action to darkness. Because desire is inherent and immanent in all these, therefore it is not counted separately here.

To acquire definite knowledge of these matters 'the *Black* and *White* divisions of the *Vedas* should be studied together with the *Shākhās*.'[1]

The *Ṛk* has four *Shākhās* appended to its white, and as many to its black, division. In all these the element of cognition is dealt with.

The *Yajuh* has similarly eight *Shākhās*, four for each of its two divisions, all dealing with action.

---

[1] The wording employed throughout this small chapter, in the original, leaves it wholly doubtful as to what exactly is the relation between the *Vedas*, the *Kṛṣhṇa* and *Shukla*, and the *Shākhās*, and whether they are all separated from each other or not. At one time, the words are, 'the Black Branches and the White Branches'; at another, 'the Black and the White *and* the *Shākhās*', implying three sets instead of two. The general impression left by the whole is that they are three sets; *i.e.*, to say, the *Veḍa* proper is as the trunk of the tree, Black and White are two main branches, and *Shākhās* are minor branches springing from each of these two; not that *Kṛṣhṇa* plus *Shukla* is equal to *Veḍa*-

The *Sāma* has ten *Shākhās*, 'by the measure of the figure ten' (?); otherwise indeed its branches are beyond count, for it deals with desire, which is endless and includes everything. In the popular saying, that the *Sāma* has a thousand branches, the word thousand signifies this same countlessness only.

The *Aṭharva* has also eight *Shākhās*, half belonging to each division.[1]

These branches constitute what is called the *Yanṭra-Shāsṭra*, that whereby the world-process

---

proper or that all the *Shākhās* of Kṛshṇa added together are *Kṛshṇa*, and so on.

[1] In the current *Mahā-Bhāṣhya* of Paṭañjali, and in some of the 'minor' *Upaniṣhaṭs*, the statement occurs, with slight variations, that: The *Ṛk* is twenty-one-fold, the *Yajuh* one hundred and one-fold, the *Sāma* a thousand-fold, and the *Aṭharva* nine-fold. But what it exactly means, (1) rescensions, different versions of different schools, or (2) chapters, sections, divisions, parts, or (3) separate appendices, as here, the modern Paṇḍiṭ cannot say. So far as 'black' and 'white' sub-divisions are concerned, only in respect of one *Veḍa*, the *Yajuh*, is such a distinction current now; and the two are regarded as two different rescensions of what is in substance, and very largely in words also, the same. They are also spoken of as the two *Shākhās* of the *Yajuh*, the 'of' indicating identity, as in 'the city of Benares'.

is y a n ṭ r y a ṭ e, 'bound together,' 'determined,' 'compelled,' or 'constrained (as by y a n ṭ r a, figure, scheme, diagram, machine)'.

Y a n ṭ r a ṇ a, binding together, organisation, is possible only as regards s a m ū h a, groups; and groups are of atoms only, atoms of light and atoms of darkness. The allocation and functioning, or radiation and expansion, of these is described in these *Shākhās*. They tell us what and how many atoms of each kind are present and active in any place. As a fact we see the functioning of both in the world. In some places light preponderates, in others darkness; in still others both are equal. In some places there is an excess of energy, in others a deficiency; in still others an evenness and balance of power. In this fashion arise endless varieties of objects. The doscription of these belongs to the *Shākhās*.[1]

[1]What is the meaning of these atoms of light and atoms of darkness? We can catch but the vaguest glimpses of the possibilities of knowledge and its application contained in this *Yanṭra-Shāsṭra*, 'material science,' *i.e.*, physical plus superphysical science, in the fullest sense of the term. There is a theory under discussion in modern times, which speaks of two kinds of atoms, 'holes in ether' and 'vortex rings of ether'; one in which or through which energy 'sinks' and disappears and another through which or from which it evolves and 'wells' forth. Theosophical literature speaks of l a y a centres, 'critical

Hence the injunction that the *Veḍa* should be studied with, 'the *Shākhās*, with the *Kṛṣhṇa*,

---

states' or points of transformation from one condition to another. Where everything is dual, positive and negative, why should not atoms be dual also, corresponding to positive and negative? If electricity is material, as is surmised by some, may not negative electricity consist of a stream of one kind of atoms, electrons, ions or however else they are named, and positive electricity of a stream of the opposite kind? (That an atom is divided into two halves, one positive and one negative, and that its stability is due to the presence of these opposite conditions which attract each other, is one of the many theories as to the nature of the atom put forward by the modern scientist. But the text seems to indicate much more than this, and is much the same as the theory respecting atoms that are "wells" or "founts' of energy and atoms that are "sinks" of energy, *i.e.*, in which energy disappears. These two kinds of atoms have also been called "male" and "female" atoms. A. B. See *Occult Chemistry*). It is said in the text that the light atoms correspond to A, the Self; and the dark atoms to U, the Not-Self; in *The Science of Peace* and in various foot-notes and the text here occasionally, it has been suggested that of every pair of planes, the subtler and inner corresponds to the Self and the denser and outer to the Not-Self; the atoms of the two may be opposed in quality to each other. It has been said, in theosophical literature, that all these planes within

with the *Shukla* and Samvṛṭa (?).[1] Otherwise it is useless. It is true that these branches or

---

planes are arranged as an endless chain of alternate worlds of causes and worlds of effects; this implies another aspect of the same thing.

Psychically, with reference to such a statement in the text as that the *Ṛk* dealing with cognition has two sets of appendices, belonging respectively to its two divisions of black and white, we may conjecture that the error-division of cognition would deal with dark-atoms and the truth-division of it with light-atoms. So under desire, love appears as bright smiles and hate as dark frowns, and shades of love and hate have corresponding shades of color associated with them, as pale with fear, red with shame, green with envy, rosy with love, black with rage, and so on. So under action, well-directed and successful industry produces vigor and 'glowing' health, and the opposite, 'black' depression and fatigue and enervation, anœmic 'lividity,' and so on. The *Yoga-Sutras* speak of actions of three colors.

Yet, again, with reference to the statement in the text, that cognition corresponds to light and action to darkness, we may remember that cognition is acquisition, is the storing up of energy, the building up of healthy organic tissue, whereas action is expenditure, the discharge or setting free of energy, the disintegration of tissue into toxins.

[1]The word samvṛṭa is difficult to understand. In ordinary modern Samskṛṭ it means 'enveloped.'

appendices are part of and not separate from the *Veḍas*, yet they are generally regarded as upākhyāna, supplementary expositions, whence the need for the injunction.

The authors of these *Shākhās* are, as before the subordinates of Mahā-Viṣhṇu, *viz.*, Viṣhṇu, Brahmā and Shiva, and their subordinate executive.

After the formulation of these *Shākhās* is the whole of the saṃsāra framed and carried out, from the brahmāṇḍa up to all that is reckoned within a saṃsāra (in the technical sense of 'the world-system of a Mahā-Viṣhṇu,' and not in the general sense of the World-process). And in accordance with the methods laid down here does the progressed jīva become the creator of new saṃsāras. And this is its attainment to the condition of Para-Brahman.

Such is the universal *Brahma-Viḍyā*, the Science of Brahman, embodied in the *Veḍa*,

---

It is also a technical class-name in Samskṛṭ grammar, for certain letters of the alphabet. In this work, later on, samvṛṭa and prāvṛṭa are said to be the names of sensations corresponding to the two subtler elements, āḍi and anupāḍaka. In Vāchaspaṭi's *Yoga-Bhāṣhya-Tikā*, the word occurs in one or two places, but in an equally elusive manner. There are indications on his works that Vāchaspaṭi had access to some literature which is not now extant.

composed of light and darkness, without acquiring which the high estate of Brahman may not be achieved, nor the supreme bliss of a transcending peace attained. To gain that lofty peace this highest science, this all-comprehending knowledge, must be gathered, and for the gathering thereof the brahma-charya stage of life has been ordained and set apart.

Yet far beyond the reaching and the teaching
Of all the *Veḍas*, *Manṭra*, *Samhiṭā*,
And *Brāhmaṇa* and *Upanishaṭ* too,
And *Kṛshṇa*, *Shukla*, *Shākhās*, soars the Self,
Eternal Consciousness apart from all;
Not by conjunctions of minutest atoms,
Nor by disjunctions of them is It gained;
Nor mineral, nor plant, nor animal,
Nor human, nor divine, nor other lives
And lines of evolution, subtle, gross,
Stretching unendingly, behind, beyond,
May compass or exhaust Its Plenitude,
Infinite, Universal, All-Pervading,
Formless, and yet all forms at once in One.

SECTION III. (*Continued.*)

CHAPTER XIII.

THE VEḌĀṄGAS.

The *Aṅgas* or 'limbs' of the *Veḍas.*—Their proper order in nature and for study.

We have seen how these six, the *Veḍas,* the *Brāhmaṇas,* the *Upanishats,* the *Upa-Veḍas* and the *Kṛshṇa* and *Shukla Shākhās* together with their summation, the seventh (*viz.,* the Science of the *Praṇava*), respectively connected with cognition, desire and action in their duplicate(?) combinations and in their summation, are all inherent in the transcendental AUM, and, in their totality, constitute the entire ideation of the World-process, the principles underlying its methods and the laws under which it is carried on. In their totality they constitute the Sanāṭana Ḍharma, and are the proper study of the first portion of life. All other work should be entered on after they have been mastered, for with knowledge of them all else may be accomplished.

Now, that whereby or with the help of which the full knowledge of these may be secured is known as the *Aṅga,* the limb, the instrumental

organ, the subsidiary or subservient science. As the *Brahma-Sūṭra* says: That by means of which something is accomplished is an aṅga thereof. It is true that it has also been declared that there is no difference or separateness between the end and the means; but this is true only from the transcendental standpoint, while for practical purposes they are distinguishable. Therefore, though the *Veḍas* constitute the whole ideation of the whole saṃsāra and there is nothing left outside of them, still, the method and means of interpreting and understanding them may be regarded as separate from them, as one organ from a whole organism. An organism is not different from the organs of which it is made up, yet 'organ' and 'organism' have a meaning only when we think of the organism as a collective whole *possessing* parts, and of each of the latter as *belonging* to the former.[1] Neither has any

[1] This is one of the endless illustrations of the vital importance of the distinction between the 'transcendental' and the 'empirical, experiential or practical' standpoint. The World-process as a *Universal* Whole is absolutely nothing else than the summation of all its parts (which, by the way, abolish each other, and in the summation, leave behind only the Absolute Vacuum-Plenum, the I—Not-I—Not). But any *particular* aggregate, *an* organism, *an* individual, while composed of parts, is yet

sense by itself, without reference to the other, yet, or, rather, for that very reason, the two are distinguishable from each other. But in the performance of action the two must necessarily be together, as one. This is all the significance of a collective whole, an aggregate; and the whole World-process is but such

---

also something else than the parts. An animal deprived of one or more limbs or organs, still remains that animal. "The tendency to materialise psychic things," deprecated by many people, (*vide*, for an illustration at random, p. 230 of *Mind*, for April 1906) corresponds to a fact in nature. 'An organism,' 'an individual,' 'a species,' 'a type,' is a psychic idea, but *because* it *means* an aggregate of 'organs,' 'parts,' 'singulars,' 'particulars,' *therefore*, in order that there may be some reason, some explanation, for its coming into contact with the latter at all, it also takes on, by a ḍ h y ā r o p a, superimposition, *some* characteristic of the latter and *becomes* material; it becomes an 'animating principle,' a 'soul or subtle body,' a 'group-soul,' an 'independently-existing archetype' etc., in an endless series of plane within plane and world within world and body within body. Indeed, the whole of the manifest World-process is an attempt, an incessant and ever-unsuccessful attempt, to *materialise* the *transcendental* Idea of the Self, to em-*body* and define in terms of matter (for there is no other way of defining), that which is ever 'Not-Matter'. (See *The Science of Peace*, pp. 131, 143.)

a collection. Each depends upon all and all on each; there is not any one thing that is really independent of any other thing. On this same principle the *Veḍas* need the *Aṅgas*.

These *Aṅgas* expound the order and arrangement of the whole *Veḍa* and so help the understanding thereof; for so long as the successive order of any investigation, the history of any development of knowledge regarding any subject, is not known, that subject is not perfectly understood. It is true that, generally, the whole is first sighted in the mass, in outline, in a bird's-eye view; but, thereafter, the parts have to be examined in succession if fuller knowledge is desired, and hence there is always a *succession* in every study. In this same way is the knowledge (of the main truth) of the whole World-process acquired, and the *Veḍas* have to be studied in accordance with this principle.[1]

---

[1] This paragraph embodies the principles and theory of pedagogy. The modern educationist's difficulty, 'general education first or specialisation,' is solved here by combining both. As usual, the truth lies in the *via media* which accepts both sides of every question and endeavors to combine both in a workable compromise. But in times and places when extremes prevail violently and men's minds are dominated by the Egoistic intelligence, and passions are strong and the lower form of

The *Veḍa* corresponds to A; the *Aṅga* to U; the essence of both (the *Upāṅga*) to M; the *Praṇava* is the summation of all.

We have seen that the *Veḍa* sub-divides into six classes, *Samhiṭā*, *Brāhmaṇa*, *Upāniṣhaṭ*, *Ṭanṭra*, *Kṛṣhṇa-Yanṭra*, and *Shukla-Yanṭra*, by the permutations of cognition and action (with desire). And, accordingly, the *Aṅgas* are also six, as declared in the injunction: Know Brahman by the six *Aṅgas*. These are: *Shikṣhā*, *Kalpa*, *Vyākaraṇa*, *Nirukṭa*, *Chhanḍah*, and *Jyoṭiṣha*. But the order in which they are usually studied, with reference to their comparative practical importance, is: *Vyākaraṇa*, *Shikṣhā*, *Kalpa*, *Chhanḍah*, *Nirukṭa* and *Jyoṭiṣha*. It should be remembered however that there is no really fixed or essential order amongst them.

(i) *Vyākaraṇa* or Grammar, literally, 'spreading out, displaying, evolving'.—Relation between grammar and language.—The significance of language, expression of desire.—The significance of grammar, effective use of language.—Reasons for the study

---

democracy is rampant because of the degenaration of true aristocracy, and s a ṅ k a r a, mixture, confusion, adulteration of all castes, classes, rights and duties rules the day, and m a r y ā ḍ ā, wise conventions and limitations of self-indulgence, are broken through, then and there such reconciliation is difficult.

of grammar.—High and low tones, and forms and colors of sounds.—Mutual relations of the root-elements.—Relation between sound and ā k ā s h a.—The genesis of language.—The Samskṛt.—Endless kinds and divisions of language, according to different planes of matter, and different regions within each plane.—Dialects.—Cause of change.—Shiva, the author of the primal work on grammar.—The genesis of the alphabet.—The reason for the order thereof.—Words.—Their main classes or parts of speech, nouns, verbs and prepositional terminations, corresponding to A, U, and M.—Sub-divisions under each.—The transcendence of all language by the Absolute.

Vyākaraṇa is regarded as the most useful of all the means to the study of the *Vedas*, because it pervades the other means or *Aṅgas* and is the only means of understanding *them*. That whereby (all words) are 'uttered,' v y ā k r i y a n ṭ e, analysed, formulated, manifested, evolved, or derived, that is *Vyākaraṇa*. This science collects together all expressive sounds or words, analyses and expounds them, teaches their 'behaviour' and use, and their derivation or origin and etymology generally; also the necessity of every word or sound and the necessity of its use.

A preliminary discussion may be disposed of here. Grammar is said to be the means and language the end. Everyone knows that

grammar is of and from language. Thus, it has been said: All the verbal activity that there is in the wide world—for its proper understanding was grammar constructed; by the study of this science of language is the essence of the truth about sound understood, and through knowledge of Shabḍa-Brahman man becometh Brahman.[1] Now, generally speaking,

[1] Brahman, as pointed out in a previous note, means, etymologically, the great, the large and that which has the potency of expansion. In other words, it means the eternal, the Infinite, and also the Principle of infinite multiplication and expansion in the realm of the limited. This potency and principle is present in every kind and form of piece of matter, yet, at our stage of evolution and to us, it is most observable in the seed of life which reproduces the ancestral or parental form infinitely, and in the seed or power or faculty of sound and language which reproduces thought infinitely. Therefore we have the expression Shabḍa-Brahman used prominently. In the word brahmacharya the idea of securing, storing up Brahman, in all its senses (the principle and potency of reproducing and multiplying the physical as well as the mental or psychical life infinitely) is implied. Now and then we meet with anna-Brahman, food-grain, or Pañcha-Brahman (five forms of Shiva, meaning, one way, the five ṭaṭṭvas) etc. Shabḍa-Brahman has thus come to mean both 'sound' in the general or

that to which another belongs precedes, and that which belongs to another succeeds; therefore grammar should be subsequent to language. Yet, so peculiar is the relation between language and grammar that most people think that the latter precedes and the former succeeds; for, without grammar, language cannot be used correctly or words put one after another in their appropriate places. Those who do not know discriminatingly what language is or what grammar is, even they know that such and such a word conveys such and such a meaning, that this or this word should be employed in such or such a reference. From all this it may well be inferred that grammar precedes langu-

---

abstract sense, shabḍa-sâmânya, the same as AUM, (*vide* Shankara's *Māndūkya Bhāṣhya*) and also all the *forms* of sound, especially articulate, which embody thought. This last sense, that of the whole mass of knowledge, enshrined in words, which has to be passed through by the jīva, before it realises the Formless Brahman, is the one meant in the text here. Another form of the same thought is expressed in the common Veḍanṭa-saying, *viz.*, by study of the shâsṭras or books, one obtains parokṣha-jñâna, indirect or *word-knowledge*, Shabḍa-Brahman; then by inner meditation, one obtains aparokṣha-jñâna, direct cognition or realisation of Brahman. Compare the expression "vital and *spermatic* books" in Emerson's *Books*.

age. It is true that the *name* **vyākaraṇa** is a consequent of language, but the *thing* named is precedent.[1] That which pre-exists in the root manifests in the branch. As the *Brahma-Sūṭra* says: All things follow out the contents of their roots in their development. In the net result of this discussion we may hold that grammar manifests language and language grammar, in a mutual dependence; even as the World-process, being the interplay of two factors, is evolved by Necessity, which Necessity, in turn, rests in and depends on the Pair.

---

[1] This sentence is the key to the whole discussion, which may otherwise seem mere logomachy. In strict truth, from the transcendental standpoint, laws are contemporaneous with the facts which they govern; there is no succession between them. From the empirical standpoint, dealing with the limited, laws *precede* facts which they cause to arise as effects; but the human discovery of laws *succeeds* the observation of facts. Hence, while that architechtonic of all or any language or languages whatsoever, that scheme of laws or causes, by which and according to which all or any language is evolved, may be said to precede all languages or any particular language, the language itself *manifests* first and its laws are afterwards gathered up by observers into the science called grammar. So Brahmā (the Third Logos of Theosophical literature) *manifests* and is *named* first, and then in succession, Vishṇu (the Second) and Shiva (the First Logos).

The essential purpose or significance of language is the expression, communication to another person, of one person's desire. The mutual expression of needs is language. These needs arise necessarily out of the universal and incessant operation of cognition, desire and action, and in this successive order.[1] Thus when I have a cognition, 'this is so and so,' that cognition gives rise to, is linked with, a desire, whence arises action in turn. But it happens very often that my desire cannot be fulfilled unless I express it to others. The reason for this state of things—that the desire of one should be capable of comprehension and fulfilment by another at all—is this: The Self is full and complete and exists everywhere and is one, whence I and another are the same; but the individualised self is not full, it is incomplete, imperfect, and therefore necessarily and always endeavors to project itself into the Full I; and this projection is the inner

---

[1] All mere description, of historical or scientific laws or facts, will also always be found on analysis to have ultimately a reference to a *purpose*, a wish, the wish to guide future action so as to secure happiness and avoid sorrow. This is the doctrine of the current *Mīmāmsā* system of philosophy. The *Veḍānṭa* adds just one exception: the only knowledge which is its own end, and leads to no further action, is the knowledge of Brahman, the Self.

significance of the statement, by one individual, of his desire, to another. Because all Self is one, therefore all selves are one, and therefore everything can and may and should be communicated, revealed, unveiled, to every one by every one. And language—spoken or sound-language in this particluar cycle—is the means of such communication.

In other words and from another standpoint, the desire that is in me can be fulfilled and satisfied only by communication to another, because, as explained before, desire is ever-fulfilled (Bliss) in the Whole and ever-unsatisfied (Want) in the part; and resting, abiding in, being in rapport with, the Whole is y o g a, and y o g a is the conjunction, the union, of the I and the This; and so the disclosing of the I to the This and of the This to the I is the using of language[1]. The two, Self and Not-Self, are the Complete only when together; either, by itself, were incomplete; hence the mutual exchange of what is in me but not in another (regarded as not-me) and *vice versa*.

---

[1] In the previous paragraph, the point of view is that of many individual selves side by side with each other; in this it is that of each individual self regarding itself as the Whole Self and all else as Not-Self. This may be gathered fully from what follows.

It should be noted that to any one individual I, another individual I or self is but a This, a not-Self; and hence the manifestation of manyness in and to the individual. The regarding of the Self as different from the Not-Self, the treating of all things else as not-Self and as separate from one's self, the consciousness which says 'that which I am, This is not'—this is the primal manyness. In the midst of such manyness is mutual converse possible, and that conversation is language.

As a man may issue from his house and, wandering in a forest, may get lost, and, running round and round in the darkness, may not find his home till he emerges on a good road; and the cause thereof would be only the darkness of his ignorance of the true road, and the fixed belief that one special place only was his home, for, otherwise, he would either be able to take the straight road to his house at once, or would make a residence for himself anywhere in the forest, or, indeed, anywhere on the surface of the earth; even so, the I, believing itself to be (identified with only one "this" and) different from all (other) 'this's,' spreads around itself this net of manyness and suffers pain and want and incompleteness, and, in ignorance (of the essential unity), desires to utter (its wishes) to *another.*[1]

---

[1] Compare the idea of s a n n y ā s a, the fourth

Otherwise, truly, there would be and is no sound, no space, no time. As has been said: Where knowledge arises in fullness, there words disappear; they appear and reappear only when and where separateness appears. Knowledge destroys separateness, and then all sounds vanish; only the AUM remains.

Thus, then, we see that language arises and exists only for the expression of desire and necessity. And by the proper use of language man attains to honor, importance, weight, *gaurava*, exalted 'teachership,' the highest goals; by the non-use or misuse thereof he slays himself and his interests. The unnecessary, *i.e.*, improper word is the *vāg-vajra*, the 'word-lightning' that destroys the utterer. The words that express the desire fully and adequately are useful; all others are useless. Hence the same kind of speech is not appropriate for all occasions; sometimes sweet words, sometimes bitter, at others even and equable ones are needed. All of which is taught by grammar.

In other words, the difference between language and grammar is that the former is the utterance of one's desire in any way or manner, any how, whereas the latter is the orderly arrangement of the words, or the order governing the effective employment of the words.

stage of life, of 'homeless' wandering, when all the world has become 'home'.

The reasons for studying grammar may be more precisely enumerated thus: (*a*) The due guarding or proper choice of words. (*b*) The formation of well-connected and well-reasoned speech; 'is this the proper time for this or not,' etc. (*c*) The observance of the appropriate occasion, as ascertainable from the *Āgama*, the scriptural sciences; speaking with a due regard for the needs and requirements of others as fixed by nature; whence accrue trustworthiness and authority. (*d*) Brevity, the use of few words conveying much meaning. (*e*) Freedom from ambiguity, avoidance of words which may give rise to doubt as to the meaning intended. [1]

Grammar should be primarily studied in (and of) the mother-tongue, for the communication of desires is most needed amidst the surroundings and the people, the country and the family, amidst which one is born. When one goes to another country, or into another family, then only does he need to know another language. Not knowing his own language well, what advantage can a person derive from another tongue? All these things are regulated by necessity, as usual. Without necessity, a language is not learnt. And many varieties arise in consequence of the operation of necessity. Thus,

---

1 These reasons are mentioned in the current *Mahā-Bhāṣhya* of Paṭañjali also.

some know their own as well as many other tongues; some know their own and none other; others do not know even their own tongue (well); still others (even if they know) are disinclined to speak, by temperament.

Prajñāpana, communication, corresponds to A; vyākaraṇa, grammar, to U; and bhāṣhā, language, to M. Hence the tradition that the grammarians know the *Praṇava* pre-eminently, and that grammar should be studied for the due understanding of the *Praṇava.*

Grammar primarily imparts knowledge of words, shabḍas, and of the correct use of words. A word is a collection of varṇas[1], letters. By the successive conjunction of letters all words arise, *e.g.*, the word Āṭmā is made up of two '*a's*, one *ṭ*, an *m*, and again two '*a's*.

Differences of tone, uḍāṭṭa, high, anuḍāṭṭa, low, and svariṭa, even, are also explained in grammar.

Besides teaching the origin of words, their necessity, and their mutual connexion, it also explains what sound-word or language prevails in which part of the world-system and in what time-cycle; what the relation is between the time and the language; between the time and

---

[1] The word means letters, as well as colors and also castes. The significance of this multiplicity of meanings will appear later.

the paḍārṭha, the thing meant, implied, connoted or denoted by the term or word; and, again, between the word and its import, the thing indicated by it. And all this is explained with reasons and in the light of principles.

The *forms* and *colors* of sounds or words are also described therein. It is true that sounds belong to ākāsha and as such have no visual quality, form or color; still, at the present stage of evolution of our world-system, because of the commixture of the ṭaṭṭvas, the elements, sounds have come to possess corresponding colors and forms. When ākāsha mixes with and manifests its nature in vāyu, its property sound also does so. The case is the same with colors, black, yellow, etc. The forms and colors of word-sounds follow the constituent ṭejas elements of the things named by them; for instance, when it is said that such and such a thing is composed (predominantly) of ākāsha or vāyu or ṭejas, and is named by such and such a name, what happens is that the property of the other (non-prominent component) ṭejas-element (present in the thing) is imposed on and associated with the name-sound. (That is to say, the name-sound corresponding to the ākāsha-factor in an object becomes inseparably connected with the color, taste, touch, smell, etc., belonging to the other

elemental factors entering into the composition of that object, and that, instead of saying in the correct but cumbersome way that such and such an object is made up of such and such items and has such and such sense-qualities, people say somewhat loosely but conveniently for practical purposes that such and such a sound *has* such and such a visible quality). One particular name-sound becomes the recognised appellation of one thing, only when it becomes established as an indispensable item in all the 'behaviour,' the 'life,' or the practical uses and applications, of that thing. (In this wise, the various elements receive, each of them, many names.) Ā k ā s h a entering into or working in v ā y u receives the name of v y o m a; in ṭ e j a s, of g a g a n a; and so on.[1] Because sound is the property of ā k ā s h a, and ā k ā s h a pervades, enters into the composition of, all things, therefore all things can be designated in terms of sound.[2] The nature and mode

[1] Which indicates how each one of so-called 'synonyms' in Samskṛṭ, the 'well-constructed' language, has a special and most important philosophical and scientific significance unfortunately lost now to the public, for hundreds of years, but to be recovered anew, let us hope, by earnest and reverent-minded study.

[2] All this paragraph seems to be full of important and illuminative suggestions. Many difficulties

of the sound-name of everything corresponds to the nature and mode (*i.e.*, sub-division, atomic arrangement, vibration, etc.) of the ākāsha-factor in it, and, because of this, sounds, although all equally born of ākāsha, differ in different conditions, as for instance, they become in consequence of affection, or anger either sweet or bitter, soft or harsh, endurable or unbearable, fair or foul.

Sounds, words, are universal because ākāsha is universal. The relation of identity between the two is that of supporter and supported, āḍhāra and āḍheya, substance and attribute (which, while distinguishable, are yet one and the same). Ākāsha is the substratum of sound; hence the latter is the property of the former. As the body is nothing without the jīva and the jīva nothing without the body—such too is the relation between ākāsha and sound. Hence the statement that sound is of

---

and conflicting theories of comparative philology about the origin and nature of language, and incidentally also the differences of the various philosophical theories known as nominalism, realism, conceptualism, etc., seem to be reconciled and set at rest by the views propounded here.

Given a certain constitution of the senses of knowledge in an individual, given also a certain elemental composition of an object in the presence of that individual, it naturally follows that each component

the nature of or is ensouled by or is the soul of ā k ā s h a.

---

element of the object having a certain sense-quality will be apprehended in terms of that quality by each corresponding sense-organ of the individual; and the sensations arising in the individual will, for the future, be to him the marks, remembrances, designations of that object. Such will be the individual's *original* 'names' for the object he comes across, which names he will be able to reproduce (to others according to his necessities, making himself intelligible to them so far as they have a constitution similar to his), by means of his organs of action respectively corresponding to his organs of sensation. Differences will be made by the differing sensory and motor constitution of different individuals. The individuals of one family, tribe, race, stock, having similar physical and physiological constitutions of their sensor and motor apparatus will have similar names and a similar language; to the extent that their constitutions differ their names will differ, giving rise to personal peculiarities, differences of pronunciation, mannerism, dialects, and finally widely different languages.

These, on the views set forth in the text, would appear to be the fundamental principles of comparative philology, (the Science of Language in the fullest sense, and not merely that of grammar proper in the modern sense), and all the other philological laws would be subordinate to them.

Sound corresponds to A; ā k ā s h a to U; the absence of both is M.

We may note especially that language, though it is sound-language predominantly at the present stage of animal and human evolution, is, on the views of the text, capable of being rendered equally well in terms of any other sense, provided the motor-organ corresponding to that sense is properly developed. It so happens that the present human has developed only the vocal apparatus, for producing sound, corresponding to the ear, the organ for apprehending it. Later humanity, at a higher stage of evolution, probably some millions of years hence, or even in subsequent rounds, may develop corresponding organs for reproducing touches, colors, tastes, smells, etc., with the same facility and in equal perfection. Then they would be able to communicate with each other in any one of these many languages. And evidence of this possibility we may see even to-day in parts of the sign-languages of deaf-mutes or foreigners and the various ways of communication of insects, birds and beasts, some of whom communicate with each other by touch, others by smell, etc. The hands, made of the ṭ e j a s-ṭ a ṭ ṭ v a, in one aspect, are the natural organs of color or form-production. As regards the possibilities of other organs, the story of the king Ṛṣhabha-ḍeva in the *Viṣhṇu-Bhāgavaṭa* gives us suggestions. That at our present stage of evolution, the production of speech should be connected with the organ for the apprehension of taste, r a s a

Because ā k ā s h a and sound are connected with (and present in the composition and constitution of)[1] all things, therefore is there one lan-

---

and that the reproduction of life should be connected with a k a r m e n ḍ r i y a also formed of the ā p a s-ṭ a ṭ ṭ v a (*Manu*, I. 8, 10; *Viṣhṇu-Bhāgavaṭa* III. xxvi. 57, etc.)—is matter for reflexion and occult research. Metaphysically, all possible combinations must also actually manifest, sometime, somewhere; and these are only particular instances.

[1] In this fact may be seen the explanation of the literal aspect of the assertion that the AUM-sound is the source and origin of the world. We may try to understand the statement thus: Earth is the source of all earthenware; and its primal property, whatever it be, is the parent of all the 'peculiar' properties that the different kinds of earthenware display. Suppose now that earth and its elemental homogeneous property were reducible into 'water' and its primal property; that into 'fire'; that into 'air'; that into 'ā k ā s h a' and sound. Then we could say that ā k ā s h a and its property were the homogeneous source of all the heterogeneous things and properties which make up the present world. Now this primal, elemental, homogeneous sound is the AUM-sound. (See Shaṅkara's *Bhāṣhya* on the *Māṇdūkya-Upaniṣhaṭ*.) The hum of the bee, the crooning of the infant, the distant boom of the ocean, the roar of rivers and great towns, all the notes of the gamut, are modifications of it, as all nourishing foods and tastes are modifications of the

guage which covers the whole samsāra, and there is a universal grammar corresponding to it. In that language no changes take place; it shines fixedly like Brahman everywhere. It is true that there is a manyness included within Brahman also, but that is always subordinated to the Unity; and such is the case with this universal language also. It is the Samsāra-parā, and for these reasons is specially dominated the Samskṛt,[1] for it is 'consecrated'. The consecra-

primal nourisher milk and its taste. All the heterogeneous pre-exists in the homogeneous; all the functions of the waking life in sushupṭi; all the life of the Not-Self in the samāḍhi of the Self. To make the one richer, we must make a deeper plunge into the other. The stronger the niroḍha, the stronger the vyuṭṭhāna afterwards, and *vice versā.* By arriving at the pinhole in a pinhole camera, an atom from a ray of light millions of miles distant has a chance of passing on to another ray of light, which it could not reach otherwise. So by 'practice' of japa of the AUM-sound, may a jīva secure special results; and even more by meditating on the 'meaning' of it, for that leads to subtler planes of matter. (See *Yoga-Sūṭra*, I. 27, 28.) By going back to the 'origins' we can make fresh advances in new directions.

[1] Samsāra-parā may be regarded as the proper name of the language, (? the Senzār of *The Secret Doctrine*), or it may be interpreted simply as a decription of it, 'concerned with the whole world-

tion consists in the establishment on a fixed grammatical basis. There are many sub-divisions in Samskṛṭ also, but, as said before, they are all subordinate to and form parts of a unity.

---

system'. The Samskṛṭa, or as now familiarly written, Samskṛṭ, mentioned here is not exactly what is now meant by the word, but that and much else besides, as will appear from what follows in the text immediately. There are two ways in which we can conceive of a universal language and its operation, both apparently equally true and effective in their respective times and places. (1) We may regard the universal language as consisting of the totality of all languages. It is obvious that no two words are exactly synonymous in the same language; no more can two even apparently equivalent words of two different languages express exactly the same shade of meaning, the same aspect of the same thing. Consequently, only all the words of all the languages taken together of any one world-system can exhaust all the expressible or utterable 'meanings,' all the objects, of that world-system. And the grammar and the dictionary of such a language would be to all the languages of the world-system, as the grammar and dictionary of one language are to all the dialects and technical glossaries of it. (2) With reference to the basic metaphysical principle of unity in diversity and the fact that the various races of men and their languages, however widely differentiated now, must have had a common ancestry, and still have a 'group-soul,' a

This Samskṛṭ tongue, the universal language, the chief of all languages, the m a h ā-b h ā ṣ h ā, the 'great speech,' wholly consecrated and holy,[1] all grows out of the single sound AUM.

Hence too is it called the language of the gods and is used by them. The gods meant here are the hierarchs, the rulers and office-bearers of our world-scheme of succession and evolution, *viz.*, the ṛ ṣ h i s, m a h a r ṣ h i s, b r ā h m a ṇ a s,

---

thread of continuity, running through them in the innermost layer of their constitution, we may regard the universal language as that primeval language which belongs to this deepest layer; and we can then easily imagine that a highly evolved being, a ṛ ṣ h i, who could work on and touch this layer, supra-consciously, would be able to make himself understood by any or all individuals of the world-system, if, at the same time, he so stimulated and vitalised 'the thread of connexion and continuity' between the inner and the outer layers of the sheaths of his hearers, that the latter could consciously respond to the vibrations of the former.

Of course, it is obvious that here the words 'universal,' 'unity,' 'deepest layer,' 'common origin,' are all relative to one world-system. It should also be remembered that from a sufficiently high standpoint, even the most radically-different-seeming languages will be seen to have a common stock.

[1] 'Wholly' and 'holy' have the same root (Skeat). He who ever thinks of the Whole is alone holy.

Īshvaras, P a r a m e s h v a r a s, Mahā-Vishṇu, etc. That they communicate their wishes and ideations by means of the Samskṛṭ language may be gathered by direct observation or by inference or from *Iṭihāsa,* history.

This, the consecrated language, evolved out of the *Praṇava,* is, in turn, the fount and origin of all other languages whatsoever. It is true that the work or purpose of all languages is but one and the same, and it may well be asked therefore why there should be many derivative languages at all. The answer lies in the fact that the relation or relativity between them is similar to that which exists between the a ṇ u s, atoms, and Mahā-Vishṇu. Thus, though it is true that even above our Mahā-Vishṇu there is a higher being who stands to him as he to our atom, this does not in any way lessen our Mahā-Vishṇu's position with reference to our atoms; all our atoms must continue to look up to him with reverence. So again, each of our atoms, because of the transcendental law of relativity pervading all, is also a Mahā-Vishṇu in turn within his own sphere of work; yet it or he has also to accept, of necessity, his position in the universal gradation, as only an atom in comparison to his or our Mahā-Vishṇu. (The case is the same with languages too; each performs the same or similar work within its own sphere, relatively; yet they are

all graded together also, or, in other words, the reason for a multiplicity of languages arising out of a common language is the same as that for the manifestation of a multitudinous manyness within the Eternal Unity). For such reasons Samskṛṭ is to be regarded as the primal universal language (of our world-system) in which the ideation of the whole s a m s ā r a is executed.

Etymologically, too, that whereby s a m, all, or all together, k r i y a ṭ e, is done, is Samskṛṭ. Because all is one, therefore the language of that all-one should also be one.

Although on the general principle of endlessness prevailing everywhere, there are always languages within languages sub-divided *ad infinitum*, yet three main sub-divisions of Samskṛṭ are commonly recognised: l a u k i k a, 'of the world' or secular, v a i ḍ i k a, scriptural or religious, and ḍ h v a n i, musical resonance, inarticulate sound, connecting the other two. The second is connected with cognition and constitutes the *Veḍa*; the first is concerned with action and forms the l o k a, the world, that is to say, the speech of the world; the third is the definite but inarticulate sound which corresponds with desire and the Negation.[1] All words that

[1] Hence the 'mysterious' power of the 'elemental' sounds of nature and of music, of cries, roars, wails, laughs, to arouse 'elemental' and most powerful emotions.

bespeak knowledge only and indicate the unity of all things are of the first class; those that indicate separateness within that unity are of the second; the third class dwells immanently in both the others. In other words, that which is born or existent in the *Veḍa* is vaiḍika, and *Veḍa* or veḍa is knowledge, and knowledge (the true and complete knowledge) is universal, *i.e.*, it is to the effect that all is transcendental and triune; so, that which is born or existent in the loka, the world, is the laukika, and loka is 'seeing' diversity in unity; and finally ḍhvani is pra-ḍhvamsa or destruction, negation (of definiteness), which again is universal to all.

We have seen that shabḍa, word-sound, is born from (arises in the endeavor to pronounce, utter, manifest, define) akṣhara, the letters, the alphabet, (also the Imperishable), etc. This word-sound is of two kinds, varṇa, articulate, and ḍhvani, inarticulate but definitely audible, like pata paṭā, etc. The sounds that arise in seas and rivers, in conches and drums, in musical instruments like the vīṇā and the ṭanṭrī, etc., are all ḍhvani. Human speech, on the other hand is varṇa. Beyond the two is soundlessness and dumb silence, known as mūka-ṭva or mauna-ṭva. This also is dealt with by grammar. For ākāsha exists everywhere, nothing is without it,

and sound also must therefore exist everywhere. Silence can then mean only absence of manifestation of sound, or unmanifested sound. And this would be due only to the absence of a reason or necessity requiring expression (of wishes, etc.), or to some other cause. The consideration of such cause is the work of grammar. When such a cause exists, the power of uttering word-sounds is in abeyance, hence the silence.

By the permutation of these three divisions, *viz.*, vaiḍika, laukika and ḍhvani, scriptural, secular and musical, there arise seven, languages, modes of manifestation of consciousness in terms of sound : (i) Sāmpraṭikā, connected with mahā-nirvāṇa, the 'great peace'; (ii) Chākṣhikī, with parā-nirvāṇa, the 'superior peace or liberation'; (iii) Sāmvarṭikā, with nirvāṇa, 'peace, deliverance, extinction'; (iv) Parā, with ṭuryā, the 'fourth' state; (v) Pashyanṭī, with sushupṭi, 'sound sleep'; (vi) Maḍhyamā, with svapna, 'dreaming'; and (vii) Vaikharī, with jāgraṭ, 'the waking condition'. There are seven sub-divisions within each of these again. The three states, nirvāṇa and the higher, are known only to brāhmaṇas and yogīs. The other four are recognised 'here' *i.e.*, by ordinary human beings. At the time of pronunciation or utterance of speech, action takes place in the body in the order of the seven;

only after successively passing through the stages or conditions of the first, second, third, etc., does it appear in the seventh or vaikharī or uttered human speech. All this is to be learnt from grammar. [1]

Within this language (the vaikharī Samskṛṭ ?) there prevail other and opposed or differing languages, the local vernaculars and dialects, and thus we have a series of languages. The universal Samsāra-bhāṣhā is the 'chain of Saṃskṛṭ'. Then there are the Jagaḍ-bhāṣhā, Vishva-bhāṣhā, Loka-bhāṣhā, Brahmānda-bhāṣhā, and countless Ḍesha-bhāṣhās, because there are many ḍeshas, countries, within each brahmānda, 'world-egg'. According to the needs and necessities of each place and in accordance with the component elements and natural sound-qualities of things (taken together with the constitution of the organs of the speakers of that place), do these different languages arise, for the

[1] All this seems to mean that before any word can be uttered, can come to the birth, its soul or the thought that is behind it has to pass through the seven states of consciousness enumerated in the text. The connexion between language and reason should be kept in mind; the two are inseparable and indeed one. The analogy of the ego incarnating and excarnating, as described in modern theosophical textbooks seems to be closely followed in the life of the words we utter. (E. H. B.)

mutual communication of desires. There is a grammar for each language; and as there is a special one for each, so there is a universal grammar also by the study of which all languages can be mastered.

The composition and proportion of the vāyu and other ṭaṭṭvas or elements changes with every gavyūṭi, (two miles square); hence language changes with every gavyūṭi, also. The whole of creation is governed in its manifestation by (this principle of the proportion of) the elements. The various yonis, wombs, matrices, types, kingdoms, races and species of creatures also depend on it. Beings in whom such and such elements predominate enter into such and such yonis and such and such corresponding appropriate countries, habitats or regions of life. And every yoni has its own separate bhāṣhā, language. Thus we have the Preṭa-language, the Paishācha-language, the Gānḍharvikī, the Yākṣhikī, the Lāvaṇakī,[1] and so on. The necessity for and the causes of all these are stated in grammar.

The primal, universal *Vyākaraṇa*, the *Varṇārṇava*, was promulgated by Shiva and consists of sixty-four hundred thousand aphorisms. Many bhāṣhyas, commentaries, have been written

[1] Some of these are spoken of in the current *Kaṭhā-sariṭ-sāgara*.

thereon by the office-bearers of Shiva's line of administration. By means of these, knowledge of all the languages and all the elements of this world may be obtained. But higher than this, relating to the summation and connected with the *Mahā-Veḍa,* is the *Vyākaraṇa* of Mahā-Viṣhṇu, sixty-four crores (six hundred and forty millions) of aphorisms in extent; and it also has got its commentaries. Thus infinite is the science of language.

(But all this is beyond our reach; coming back to what is more within our means, we find that) the whole ideation of this s a m s ā r a is contained in the *Veḍas,* because ideation is possible by means of a few words comparatively, the full details being endless. And the *Vyākaraṇa* of the *Veḍas* is similar and deals with scriptural words only. This grammar, the *Vyākaraṇ-ārṇava,* has also been formulated by Shiva.[1] An

[1] By one of those nature's 'freaks' of preservation of isolated traces of things past, of which we meet with examples in other departments of life, learned memory, for a wonder, publicly retains the name of this single one out of all the old and inextant works named by Pt. Ḍhanrāj, in a solitary scholastic shloka that is often on the lips of the modern youthful student of Samskṛt grammar in India:

यान्युज्जहार माहेशाद् व्यासो व्याकरणार्णवात् ।
तानि किं पदरत्नानि भांति पाणिनिगोष्पदे ॥

arṇava, an 'ocean,' is that which expounds essential and universal principles. Because the *Veḍas* embody universal ideation, the ideation of 'all' (things), therefore their grammar also deals with 'universal' words, expressive of universal concepts and unifying laws. Shiva is the author of the grammar because he deals with desire; and language and grammar, as explained before, are concerned with the expression of it; and the head of any department of work is, directly or indirectly, the guide and administrator of all work subsidiary to it also (even though it may appear on its face to belong to another department). The *Māheshvarīya-Vyākaraṇa* arises simultaneously with the *Veḍas*, for the sake of their being duly understood. All have need of it; for without knowledge of it, the power of creating a samsàra is not possible, and without such creation, the infinite estate of Brahman is not achieved. To accomplish that Infinity, understanding of the Universal Ideation is needed; and for that, grammar.

In this *Māheshvara-Vyākaraṇa* the letters are first explained, and, amongst them, the vowels and their permutations have precedence, *viz.*, अ, इ, उ, ऋ, ऌ, ए, ओ, ऐ and औ.

"Those word-gems which Vyāsa drew out of the depths of the *Vyākaraṇārṇava*, 'The Ocean of Grammar'—how can they be found in the little cow-pond of Pāṇini!"

The first letter अ, *a*, represents the Āṭmā, the Aham, the Self, all-transcendent and universal. After that उ, *u*, is the Eṭaṭ, the Not-Self, Anāṭmā, This. The conjunction of अ and उ (*i.e.*, ओ) is the Samsāra, the World-process. The Necessity of the two dwells *between* them as इ, *i*, the Shakṭi, Energy.[1] Hence the order अ, इ, उ. ऋ, *ṛ*, and ऌ, *lṛ*, (are counted as vowels) because they are pari-sphuta, (?) definite imitations of ḍhvanis or inarticulate sounds; otherwise indeed they would be placed amongst consonants being pronounced like र and ल, *r* and *l*.

---

[1] Why अ should stand for the Self, उ for the Not-Self, इ for Energy and so on, is not explained. Probably if the science of *Shikṣhā*, including 'the physiology of language,' had been dealt with more fully in this work it would have included an explanation of this as well as the other problems which modern comparative philology has not yet succeeded in solving, *e.g.*, the origin of predicative and demonstrative roots (see Max Müller's *The Science of Language*, Vol. I, chapter ix). It would also help us, it would seem, from the lines of thought *suggested* by the statements in the text, to understand the *rationale* of the Ḍevanāgari system of handwriting, why the *Praṇava* should be written as ॐ, the *a*-sound as अ etc. In the meanwhile, we may conjecture that अ is the very first and simplest of all possible sounds resulting from the first and most simple exercise of the vocal apparatus, and is present

The proper pronunciation of these three sounds, अ first, and then of इ followed by उ, or of उ followed by इ, should be mastered by children before their fifth year, and the unity of the three should also be understood. All other vowels arise out of these. अ and इ make ए, é; अ and उ make ओ, ō; repeating the process, we find that अ and ए make ऐ, *ai*; अ and ओ, make औ, *au*;

---

in all others in some hidden way and hence is properly indicative of the Self; it is the very manifestation of the Self in sound; that while the primal resonance resulting from the simplest vocal effort, with lips closed, is the Om-sound, as soon as the lips are the least opened, that resonance takes shape as अ, *a*; that the condition of the vocal apparatus during the pronunciation of उ is such as to involve a reference, physical as well as psychical, to another than Self; and so on. As to the written character, we may surmise, as *supplementary* to the modern theory of the gradual and unconscious development of the alphabet out of pictographs, hieroglyphs, ideograms, etc., that a *deliberate* construction of forms by the 'well-instructed,' the s h i ṣ h t a, the 'remnants' of past and the guides of present evolution, would naturally follow a definite plan and symbolism. Thus, the presence of Three Factors in the Endless Whole of the World-process, is obviously expressed by the primitive way of writing the *Praṇava*, *viz.*, ॐ, which in a different position becomes the *crux ansata*, and

and so on. Next, there arise the differences of short, long and very long, hrasva, ḍīrgha, and pluṭa, corresponding to the Self, the Not-Self, and the Negation respectively. Under each of these, again, is the triple division of uḍāṭṭa, high, anuḍāṭṭa, low, and svariṭa, even. The anu-nāsika, the nasal sound, is the Necessity of these. There are still other sub-

---

seems to be also expressed in the gesture called "making the sign of benediction." The Indian abhaya-muḍrā, the gesture of protection, 'do not fear,' or jñāna-muḍrā 'the pose of thought' is almost exactly the same, the tips of the thumb and the forefinger being joined, and the other three fingers held apart. Various modifications of this ॐ, give us the written symbols of the अ, इ, and उ sounds. Quite possibly, it may be found on investigation that certain parts of the vocal apparatus present visible forms or appearances, during the utterance of the different letter-sounds, similar to those of the written Ḍeva-nāgarī character in its primitive form, as first fashioned by the hierarchs; or that the 'voice-figures' or 'vibrational arrangements of particles' produced by these sounds present those shapes.

It may be noted that some of the extant 'minor' *Upaniṣhaṭs* and works on *Ṭanṭra* also interpret इ as Shakṭi; but अ is generally interpreted as Brahmā, and उ as Viṣhṇu, while M is regarded as denoting Shiva, as here.

divisions, endlessly, whence the statement that vowels are infinite.[1]

The consonants are born from the vowels. That which is made manifest, vyajyaṭe, by others, *viz.*, vowels, is vyañjana, the consonant. These are ह, *ha*, य, *ya*, व, *va*, र, *ra*, ल, *la*; ञ, *ña*, म, *ma*, ङ, *ṅa*, ण, *ṇa*, न, *na*; झ, *jha*, भ, *bha*, घ, *gha*, ढ, *dha*, ध, *ḍha*; ज, *ja*, ब, *ba*, ग, *ga*, ड, *da*, द, *ḍa*; ख, *kha*, फ, *pha*, छ, *chha*, ठ, *tha*, थ, *ṭha*; च, *cha*, ट, *ta*, त, *ṭa*; क, *ka*, प, *pa*; श, *sha*, ष, *ṣha*, स, *sa*. These are all born from vowels; it is not possible to pronounce a consonant without a vowel. Con-

[1] Max Müller's *The Science of Language*, Vol. II. ch. iii, will help the reader in understanding the many technical Samskṛṭ words in these pages. It may be noted that very much reduced as current Samskṛṭ is, as compared with the original universal form of it, Samsāra-parā, even so its alphabet retains 'specimens' of almost all possible 'classes' of letter-sounds, even those which are supposed to peculiarly characterise languages very wide apart; thus even the 'hisses' and 'clucks' of certain savage-languages have counterparts here. (Perhaps this is a reason why Indians whose mother-tongue is one or other of the dialects derived from Samskṛṭ make, as is said, good linguists.) This is only in accordance with the principle that the seed includes all the plant; the first sub-race of the fifth Root-Race, the types of all the remaining sex sub-races; the Varṇāshrama Ḍharma of Manu, the types and main principles of all possible religions.

sonants in themselves have no distinctions of short, long, very long, and high, low and even, still they are so distinguished (according to the annexed vowels). They are divided into spṛṣhta, īṣhaṭ-spṛṣhta, vivṛṭa and samvṛṭa. To the first class belong क, ख, ग, घ, ङ, च, छ, ज, झ, ञ, ट, ठ, ड, ढ, ण, त, थ, द, ध, न, प, फ, ब, भ, म; and these are sub-divided into spṛṣhta-vivāra, spṛṣhta-nāḍa, and spṛṣhta-ghoṣha. To the second class belong य, र, ल, व, sub-divided into shvāsa, aghoṣha, and alpa-prāṇa. To the third class belong श, ष, स, and ह, sub-divided into mahā-prāṇa, mahā-shvāsa, and mahā-nāḍa. There are other sub-divisions, *ad infinitum*. There are different ways of primary classification also, according to which the letters are grouped into vargas, classes, as, for instance, the ka-varga, cha-varga, etc., in which they have been mentioned just before. The order in the varṇa-samāmnāya, the primal fourteen aphorisms, is that of their genesis; that is to say, the letter which is born from another is placed next after that. In the varga-grouping, another principle of arrangement is followed, thus, the ka-varga is kantha-sṭhāna, spṛṣhta, and vivāra-para; the cha-varga is ṭālu-sṭhāna, samspṛṣhta, samvāra-para and nāḍa-vān; the ṭa-varga is mūrḍha-sṭhāna, spṛṣhta and ghoṣha-vān; the ṭa-varga is ḍanṭa-sṭhāna,

s p ṛ ṣ h t a, n ā ḍ a-v ā n, and v i v ā r a-v ṛ ṭ a; and the p a-v a r g a is o ṣ h t h a-s ṭ h ā n a, s a m v ā r a-n i ṣ h t h a, and g h o ṣ h a-v ā n. Within each v a r g a the order is that of genesis. य, र, ल, व, (य, व, र, ल, ?) are born from and in the order of इ, उ, ऋ, ऌ, and श, ष, स, ह, from the v i s a r g a, aspirate, which resides in the अ.[1]

The permutations and combinations of these make the world of words.

The words ā m n ā y a, and s a m ā m n ā y a, well-known in the *Veḍa*, mean respectively simple and compound words (?, letters, or both).

These letters enter into coalescence with each other, and we have three kinds of such coalescence: (i) of vowels, (ii) of consonants, (iii) of the aspirate or v i s a r g a. The transformations that letters undergo during these are described in grammar in the proper places.

These letter-sounds are universal in their natural or simple as well as their coalescent or compound forms, being all derived from the universal AUM. The natural condition is that wherein, because of some necessity, there is no mixture of one with another.

Coming now to words and their kinds, arising out of the combination of letters, we see that

---

[1] These technical names indicate the particular parts of the vocal apparatus, the special effort and the 'potencies' involved in uttering each letter.

the prāṭipaḍika (or nouns, generally) correspond to the Self; the ḍhāṭu (or verbs) to the Not-Self and action; the kāraka (or prepositional inflections) to desire (which connects nouns and verbs); and the samāsa (or compound words) to the summation. Samāsana, coming or standing or sitting together, is samāsa. That which tends or causes to do or to act, karṭum, is kāraka.

That which is resolved on, praṭīyaṭe, is believed in or accepted as basis for action—that is praṭyaya. Viḍhāna, resolution, arranging out, prescribing, planning, is due to desire. All inner praṭyayas, ideas, conceptions or beliefs on which action is based, find corresponding resolutions for action in and through desire. (Hence the terminations, inflections, affixes, suffixes, etc., in grammar, which indicate the manner, in which one thing is to be related to another, the tendency by which it is to act or be acted on by another, are called praṭyayas also).

The noun in itself does not change; hence it corresponds to the Self. Verbs, on the other hand, undergo numerous changes, as classified under the ten la-kāras, sets of conjugational terminations (in Samskṛṭ grammar). And kārakas, prepositional terminations, as already said, are the producers of action.

These nouns, etc., are again sub-divided into triplets. Thus, under the noun, we have the common noun, the proper noun, the 'all-name' or pronoun. The first or prāṭipaḍika is general. The second or nāmika is a matter of rūḍhi or root, radix, 'that which grows, growth'; it is radical and technical, of conventional growth, sāṅkeṭika.[1] The third is the name of all, which all and each can take refuge in.

---

1 The reader may notice how the *opposing* theories of modern comparative philology, (i) that language is the work of an original compact, agreement or convention, and (ii) that it has grown and evolved unconsciously out of a few roots, are quietly merged into each other in the text; radical and conventional are practically made synonymous. To understand this, it should be remembered that truth always is in the mean; that when two views are supposed to conflict very violently they are in reality supplements to each other. As said in a previous foot-note in connexion with the question of precedence as between language and grammar, the fact that the same root-sound should appeal to a number of individuals equally and simultaneously implies an original, sub-conscious *agreement* or uniformity in their mental and physical constitution, which may in this sense be said to precede language; but when, in more elaborate matters such agreement is discovered or arrived at explicitly or implicitly, it *appears* as subsequent.

Under the verb, we have the third, the second and the first persons. Each of these is in turn the universal All, *i.e.*, the Self, the first person, from his own point of view; so that the first person is clearly the most important in the aspect of unity.

Under the preposition, we have, the nominative, the accusative and the instrumental (subject, object or predicate, and instrument).

Under the compound, we have, avyayī-bhāva, ḍvanḍva and ṭaṭ-purușha.

From another standpoint, words are subdivided into masculine, feminine and neuter. The cause of all these divisions and sub-divisions is always the same necessity of the primal Trinity.

Vowels and consonants make up all these nouns, verbs, prepositions, etc. Those that end in vowels are expounded in one place; those that end in consonants, in another; and out of these are derived all other words whatsoever.[1]

Knowledge of language and grammar includes four kinds of knowledge: of words; of the meanings of words; of sentences; of the meanings of sentences. The first corresponds to

---

[1] Compare Max Müller's classification of Samskṛt roots, at pp. 372-373 of *The Science of Language*, Vol. I. (Edition of 1899).

cognition; the second, to action; the third, to desire; and the fourth, to summation.

Thus, then, an accurate knowledge of words, their roots, their derivatives and classes and sub-divisions, their component letter-sounds and colors, their order, meaning, proper form and use, their connexion with each other, their respective indication of or correspondence with the Self, the Not-Self and the Negation—all this is possible only by the study of *Vyākaraṇa*.

And without such knowledge, no business of life can be carried on effectively, no sympathetic conversation is possible, and no intelligent study of the *Veḍas* can be made. Hence the primacy of the *Vyākaraṇa*.

But let it be remembered that all this is directed but towards the knowledge of the main facts of the endless details of the World-process. Otherwise, indeed, Brahman is beyond all.

> Beyond all language, all unproved by words,
> Untouched by speech, by knowledge and by
> sense,
> Imperishable, Endless, Infinite,
> Itself the one deep source, the single fount
> Of all the varied speech bubbling from life,
> And yet nor name, nor verb, nor nexus-word,
> Nor compound summing all the three in one;
> Nor subject, predicate or instrument,
> Nor plural, dual, or the singular;

Nor person, first, or second, or the third;
Nor past, nor present, nor the future too;
Nor mood, nor tense, nor the infinitive;
Nor participle, adverb, adjective;
Nor prefix, nor yet affix, nor the root;
An Undeclining indeclinable,
Steadfast in unity of blessedness!

(ii) *Shikṣhā* 'instruction'.—Needed to master the practical employment of the *Veḍas*.—The physiology of voice.—The various nerves and organs concerned with it.—Causes of differences of voice.—The regulation of it taught by this science.—The cause of deafness.—The Trinity as manifesting here.—The various topics generally dealt with by this science.

The next *Aṅga* is *Shikṣhā*, instruction. Next, because though naturally first, yet in respect of practical importance it ranks after grammar. 'Instruction' is, in a sense, the first cause of knowledge; such knowledge, in and of the world's business, must be first secured, and then only can the need arise to communicate with others, which communication is matter of language and grammar. But the utility of this shikṣhā or instruction *appears* only in its application to a language. (Hence it comes in second in the scheme of studies[1]). By the study

[1] This matter of precedence and succeedence has been dealt with in the previous portion on *Vyākaraṇa*; it crops up perennially everywhere in ever new references.

of *Shikṣhá*, the operation, the practical working, application or utilisation, of the *Veḍas* is comprehended.

In this science, the natural origin of all v a r ṇ a s,[1] letters; the reason of that origin; how v a r ṇ a s arise at all in the 'universal'; by what mechanism they are pronounced in this body; the particular s ṭ h ā n a, places, organs, (parts of the vocal apparatus, lips, palate, etc.) and the p r a y a ṭ n a, effort, by which each letter is pronounced; the designation of each according to its s ṭ h ā n a and its p r a y a ṭ n a; the laws governing these two—all these matters are explained in this science.

There[2] are two k a m a l a s, 'lotuses,' plexuses, nerve-ganglia, called a r ṇ i k ā, in the human body, in the region of the n ā b h i[3], navel,

---

[1] This word, as noted before, means kind or caste, color, and also distinct letter-sound. The underlying etymological idea seems to be that of 'manifestation' by movement or vibration, definition in sound, color, human type, etc.

[2] The text here is very obscure and compressed, and the translation in consequence is very tentative.

[3] Desire (here the desire to speak for the satisfaction of some other desire) seems to be connected with the 'navel' or solar plexus, as suggested before. *Corresponding* centres in the brain may also be meant.

Compare the medical fact that a violent fit of anger affects the liver seriously, also the common

one on the left side and one on the right. Here there exists a peculiar combination of māruṭa (air), agni (fire), ākāsha (ether), etc., which takes on activity in accordance with the will or intention of the speaker. This volitional action passes along various nāḍis, nerves, into the uras, (thorax, chest). It becomes nāḍa, (resonance ?) here, and then, passing on into the kantha, (throat, larynx), or other 'place,' appears as shabḍa, sound. It may be noted here that sound is a property of ākāsha, but is *manifested* by means of vāyu. The ākāsha-element is in full operation in the two ganglia mentioned; vāyu also acts similarly there (in subordination and as vehicle[1] to ākāsha) and is the means of the appropriate effort. When the wish to speak arises with reference to some desired object, then words or 'sounds' expressive of that desired object are uttered. That is to say, effort takes place in accordance with the wish to speak. The vāyu moves the ākāsha; that raises the unnāḍa-ḍhvani, (the 'upward-hum-explosion' ?); this takes shape after the intention, abhiprāya, of the speaker; when the sarpiṇī-nerve above the navel is

---

expressions about 'bowels of compassion,' a 'bilious or splenetic, *i.e.*, irritable person,' etc.

[1] Each plane has the next denser for 'vehicle' or 'sheath'. See *The Science of Peace*, pp. 295, 296.

reached, the full 'intention' enters into it (the ḍhvani?); thence, passing into the uras or thorax it becomes transformed into shabḍa, voice; finally, arriving in the kantha or larynx, etc., it manifests (as language).

Some letters are pronounced from or with the left side (or kamala) and some with the right; others from the middle between the two. Generally, vowels are uttered from the right ganglion and consonants from the left. The two combine in the chest. In the case of some (persons or sounds or both?) the pronunciation takes place with or from the middle. In such the vowels and consonants are not clearly distinguishable, the pronunciation is vague, for the two kamalas are very close together and 'occupy but one place' (as it were). The pronunciation of persons so specially constituted is unpleasant. Only when the two ganglia are each fully and separately developed and not mixed up and imperfect, do the ākāsha and vāyu elements find full play and the voice is pleasant in tone, distinct and easy to follow. Generally speaking, the voice is unpleasant as the two organs are close together and pleasant as the reverse is the case. Very various are the voices in this world. Some bring intense pleasure so that one longs to hear them always. Others cause pain, or irritation

or sadness. The special cause in each case is the special location, abhiḍhāna (?), of the kamalas.

Yet again, as these are sūkṣhma, 'small,' 'subtle,' finely-grained, the voice will be low and sweet; and as they are large and coarsely-formed it will be loud and harsh. For this reason are the voices of children generally sweet and soft and beautiful; for the ganglia are small. As they grow in size, the voice acquires fullness. The voices of women are soft for the same reason, ordinarily; their 'lotuses' are well-opened, small, even or equal-sized (?) and neither too near together nor too far apart. Thus there are women whose very voice inspires love.

These kamalas are formed (by the appropriate agencies) according to the laws which govern the formation of bodies or organisms under the dominance of karma, which presides over the formation and evolution of every body; hence the voice of a person is sweet or harsh according to his karma, like everything else.

Yaṭna, vocal effort, is of two kinds, internal and external. The former consists in bringing about the coalescence of the meaning intended to be expressed with the appropriate letters of the appropriate words, and the deter-

mination of the order in which they shall be uttered or expressed. The latter is the projection of the appropriate s h a k ṭ i (or nerve-force) into each letter. Thus, in the utterance of the (imperative) expression, ṭ v a m ā g a-c h h a, '(you) come,' s h a k ṭ i is projected into each syllable, in some a smaller, in others a greater, in still others an 'even' amount of it, in accordance with the varying moods intended to be expressed. The s h a k ṭ i thus differs with differing moods of anger or avarice or depression and confusion or religious fervour or feeling of duty or love and affection, or necessity or absence of need or definite purpose or doubt, and so on, endlessly.

The purpose of the science of *Shikṣhā* is to teach how to project this s h a k ṭ i so as to speak well, easily, plainly, intelligibly and with efficient rendering of the mood intended to be conveyed.

(A few remarks may be added with reference to the intimate instrumentality of ā k ā s h a and v ā y u in the production of voice[1]). When 'I'

[1] Modern science ignores ā k ā s h a, ether, in the production of sound, and regards v ā y u as the only medium of sound. This arises from the fact that the rarefactions and compressions of the air which form sound-waves are observable, while the etheric waves are imperceptible. The relation of v ā y u to

speak to 'you' the hearing of my speech rests in and with you, and the consciousness arises in you, 'This person has said so and so, the reply to which is this'; and then the reply is given which I hear. Now all this *utterance* is performed only by vāyu. Ākāsha is universal; it exists in you, in me, in the space between the two. So, vāyu too is universal. Hence is voice *manifested* by the 'moving' of the vāyu under the guidance and stress of 'my' intention. By the energy of that same intention also there results the 'moving' of the vāyu in the interval of space between you and me, and finally the hearing of the sounds by you. And you, hearing my words, either begin a reply or commence an action in accordance with my words. And so on. But there are some who do not hear, who are deaf. The reason is that while ākāsha exists evenly, in the proper proportion, in the speaker and in the interval of space, in the deaf person addressed there is a deficiency in the number of ākāsha-atoms needed. But so far as ḍhvani, inarticulate sound is concerned, vāyu acts surely, for ḍhvani is heard even if there be but one single atom of

---

sound, here shown, is consonant with modern science; in the latter, the omission of ākāsha as the chief factor of sound, disturbs the order of the senses and causes much confusion. (A. B.)

ākāsha present, sound being the property thereof and vāyu acting upon it.

The utterance of sound, the hearing of it, the recollection thereof, the expression of intention —all this exists in each atom.

The Trinity appears in this science thus: the varṇa or letter is the A; the prayaṭna or effort is the U; the sṭhāna, region or part of the vocal apparatus, is the M; the whole science is the summation. As the Self manifests in every act, so the varṇas show forth in the various efforts and vocal parts.

The main purpose of this science is to explain, in reference to the *Veḍas*, matters like these: such and such varṇas are used in such and such a ṛchā or scripture-verse; they should be pronounced thus; the sanḍhi, coalescence of letter-sounds, in this place is of this kind; the form of this letter in this sanḍhi is this; its color, this; this letter should be pronounced after this other; and for this purpose; in this metre, this letter should be pronounced in this fashion and for this reason; this is the proper vocal organ of this letter; the internal effort is this; the outer, this; the action or effect thereof is this; this is needed for the accomplishment of such and such a purpose. The connexion or combination of effort and vocal region is the cause of all sound-effects; special effects arise from special causes; the methods of pronuncia-

tion; the evil consequences of omission or inaccuracy; the losses following on those evil consequences; the need to chant in that manner if the loss itself is desired to be inflicted; or to chant otherwise if a corresponding gain is wanted; or in such another fashion if instead of ascendancy over others, equality with them is desired; and so on. Briefly, because all is necessary in samsāra, the method and order of the use of the letter-sounds of the whole of samsāra, as employed in the *Veḍas*, is explained in the science of *Shikṣhā.*

But, apart from all this, and in Itself, the Āṭmā is ever the True, the Eternal, beyond all speech.[1]

(iii) *Kalpa*, 'methodology'.—The appurtenances and appliances of study.—The special application of this science to the study of the *Veḍas.*—The scope of the science, generally.

The third *Aṅga* is *Kalpa.* It deals with the vyavasṭhā, the order of arrangement, the method of treatment, the way of discussion and investigation and examination, of all subjects of

---

[1] Pāṇini's *Vyākaraṇa* and *Shikṣhā* are now current; also special *Prāṭishākya-Vyākaraṇas* and *Shikṣhās* for the different *Veḍas*; but, of course, they do not cover the ground marked out here. Indeed the available works of *Shikṣhā* do not extend beyond a few score of verses.

human enquiry. Discussion on such and such a subject should proceed thus, in this order, for this reason and in such a style; such a v y a v a s ṭ h ā, significance, efficacy, is connected with such a word; such and such words should be employed in such and such a discussion; in such and such a subject, this item comes first, this second, this third, this fourth; it should be commenced thus and closed thus—all these matters are dealt with by *Kalpa-shāsṭra*.[1]

The reason of the birth of all a b h i p r ā y a s, intentions, purposes, objects, aims and ends; the manner in which these arise and the subjects thereof; the reason why these two, intention and its object, appear in the world—are also all described herein. Thus: This is the a b h i- p r ā y a, the intention, sense or significance of this, for this reason, with this motive; it is open to such a doubt or objection, the solution whereof is this; this is born of joy; this, of sorrow;

[1] If the material of which modern works of criticism of the higher sort are made up, and the 'introductions' of the well-edited classics also, could be systematised into a science, a science of critical study, methodology and pedagogy combined, it would perhaps answer to *Kalpa-shāsṭra* as described here. Current knowledge of this science has dwindled down to a comparatively small body of rules dealing with the method of performing certain Veḍic rites.

this in turn gives birth to sorrow; this, to joy; this, to equability; this yields fruit to, of, or through, another; this to, of, or by, oneself; and so on, with endless detail of purpose within purpose.

In application to the *Veḍas*, this science shows what subject-matter each *Veḍa* begins with; what is the order of the manṭras therein; the further matters treated of, with their reasons and uses; their mutual connexion, consistency and continuity; their various parts or sections, with the proper beginnings and endings of each; the special method of description of its subject-matter followed in each kind of manṭra or ṛk; the order inhering in it; the order and the development of the *Brāhmaṇas* and *Upaniṣhaṭs*; the necessity and the manner of their origin, etc.

Such a mood or emotion should be rendered in language thus; if in prose, then thus; if in verse, thus; in the universal language, thus; in another language, thus; the method of translation; the proper way of raising a point and of passing from it to another; the ways of ascertaining the intention or sense of the author and of inferring his physical or mental condition from his work; the reasons or necessity for the study of any particular subject; the way of appraising the value of a treatise—all this may also be learnt from this science. For it is desirable to

learn beforehand the technicalities of the subject of any work that is going to be studied, its terms, its definitions, its rules, exceptions and constructions; its applications, its aims, its extent of authority, its utilities and inutilities; whether there exist any previous works on the same subject, their nature, their similarity or otherwise with the work now to be studied; the reason for the compilation of the new work, the name of the author, his life-history, his qualifications and attainments—it is desirable to get some idea of such matters before commencing the study of any work, otherwise the study does not bear its full fruit. (Corresponding to the merits of the author, are the merits of the reader). All things are not fit to be taught to everybody; and such matters should also be duly considered with the help of *Kalpa* as, *viz.*, whether this child or student has or has not such and such capacities and qualifications, what his circumstances are, his future work in life, his inclinations, and so forth. Instruction should be commenced only after duly considering these matters. According to the subject-matter towards which the inclinations of any one run, should corresponding atoms[1] be directed. Comments, glosses,

[1] See the opening paragraphs of Sec. III. ch. xi. (on the *Upa-veḍas*) *supra*.

annotations of various kinds, should be constructed accordingly also.

Without the study of this *Kalpa-shāsṭra*, it is impossible to understand the *Veḍas*, or indeed any work.

The abhiprāya, the intention or sense, here is the A; its orderly manifestation, expression or utterance is the U; the cause or reason of the intention is the hidden relation between them, the M.

But apart from these, and in Itself, the Āṭmā is ever beyond 'all intents and purposes,' (Self-realisation being the final and the only 'intent and purpose,' of all, always and everywhere).

(iv) *Nirukṭa*, 'etymology,' 'lexicography,' 'dictionary'.—Subject, predicate and object.—The various kinds of prose and verse.—The special application of the science to Scripture.

The fourth *Aṅga* is the *Nirukṭa*. It is also called *Koṣha*, 'sheath,' 'receptacle,' 'treasury (of words).'[1] It deals with words and their meanings. It has been said before, that language is intended to express desire, and grammar to express the proper order of language; the connecting of 'meaning' with that ordered language is the work of *Koṣha*. It tells us what sense to attach to which word and why; what the grada-

---

[1] Yâska's *Nirukṭa* is the Veḍic lexicon now current.

tion and alliance is between the various meanings of the same word; why there are more than one and how they evolve gradually; why any one only should be inferred and in which circumstances; how the s v a r a, accent, emphasis or tone helps to specify the meaning; how also the special position of a word in a sentence, and the subject in the treatment of which it occurs, and other similar facts specify or change it and why; how and why many words come to have the same meaning; and so on.

That by which the meaning of a word is declared, u c h y a ṭ e, with certainty, n i s h c h a-y e n a, that is *Nir-ukṭa.* The certain is the necessary, the needed, the desired; and that is expressed by means of words. This science also teaches that the systematic interpretation of all works should be effected by, (*a*) the separation of the p a ḍ a s, distinct and complete words, simple or compound, (*b*) the explanation of each word, and (*c*) the explanation of their connexion with each other. This a n v a y a, analysis of how a sentence 'hangs together,' depends entirely on *Nirukṭa.*

There are three kinds of a n v a y a, arrangement or 'mutual following' of words, ḍ a ṇ d-ā n-v a y a, k h a ṇ d-ā n v a y a and s h u ḍ ḍ h-ā n-v a y a. In the first, the subject or the nominative term comes first, then, the object or the

accusative term and finally, the predicate or the verb. In the second, the object comes first, then, the predicate, then, the subject. In the third kind the order is, subject, predicate and object. The successive coming into relief of the meaning (of the speaker or writer) follows the anvaya, and therefore by means of it only should the sense of a sentence be fathomed.

The kartā, actor, subject, is the A; the karma, object, acted on, is the U; the kriyā-paḍa, the verb, the predicate, acting, which mediates between subject and object and shows the relation between them as also the union between the doer and the doing, is the M. Again, the shuḍḍh-ānvaya corresponds to the A; the ḍaṇ d-ānvaya to the U; and the khaṇd-ānvaya to the M; the summation is gaḍya, prose, 'that which has to be spoken'. The anvaya or the 'prose-order' of paḍya or verse is gaḍya or prose. (From another standpoint, we might say, a special arrangement or 'order' of prose is verse.)[1] Each of the three

[1] It may be debated whether prose arises first or verse. All natural elemental sounds seem to be 'repetitive' and uniform, the roar of ocean-breakers, the hum and rustle of forests, the rush and rattle of rivulets, the cries of animals, the 'songs' of birds, the sobbing and the laughing of human beings. And because repetitive and uniform, therefore

kinds of 'order' has its own appropriate place and significance for special reasons, as is explained by *Niruktạ*.

In its application to the *Veḍas*, the science shows how any particular ṛk or *Veḍa*-verse should be analysed; what each word in it means and why; how a certain subject-matter is denoted by a certain word only and by no other; and so on.

Thus, everywhere, for the discriminative use of every word and employment of every kind of verse or prose is the *Niruktạ* useful. It also ascertains the b h ū ṭ a s, elements, spoken of (?); the work of v ā y u here is this; from such ā k ā s h a such sound arises, etc.

But the Self is above and beyond all such meanings and senses.

---

rhythmical and harmonious and 'verse'-like. Thereafter comes differentiation, loss of uniformity, growth of individualism and separativeness, and prose. By a higher synthesis, a further turn of the spiral, arises deliberate word-poetry. 'Rotation' is the mean between the two extremes, the secret of the reconciliation between the opposed views. Yet, out of reverence for the Self which *may* be said to be more important than and to precede, though in strictness, it is not and does not, the not-Self, it *may* also be said that 'uniformity,' the 'type,' and verse precede heterogeneity and prose.

'Tis not the sense of any word, nor prose
Nor verse adequately may speak of It;
The many ways in which our spoken words
May be arranged, construed and analysed,
And all *Nirukṭa* leave It all untouched;
Endless, Surpassing, AUM, ever the AUM—
The I, the I, the I, the I alone,
The Pure, the True, the born of Truth, Supreme,
The added This, the This, the This, the This,
Unborn, without desire or sense or speech,
Timeless in time, Spaceless in space, Beyond,
Encompassed only by the Endless speech,
The Not, Negation of all else than I.

(v) *Chhanḍah*, metre, verse.—Three principal notes.—Permutations yield seven.—Whence twenty-one and so on.—Definition of 'song'.—Its purpose, the expression of emotions.—Its application to scripture.

The fifth *Aṅga* is *Chhanḍah*, metre, also called paḍya, verse. The difference between prose and verse with regard to the order of words is taught herein, and the various kinds of metre and the subjects to which they are severally appropriate are also explained by it. It shows what svaras, accents, are used in which metre, how many uḍāṭṭas, anuḍāṭṭas, svariṭas, and samāhṛṭas go into it, and why.

The basis of this science is the triplet just mentioned together with its summation. By permutation of these we have seven sounds or notes of music, ṣhadja, ṛṣhabha, gānḍhāra, maḍhyama, pañchama, ḍhaivaṭa and niṣhāḍa.[1] The first three are the principal notes however. The ṣhadja corresponds to A, and is uttered in uḍāṭṭa and anuḍāṭṭa accents. The ṛṣhabha corresponds to U and is uttered in uḍāṭṭa and svariṭa accents. The gānḍhāra corresponds to M and is sounded in anuḍāṭṭa and svariṭa. Thus there arise seven (?). A triple sub-division of each gives the twenty-one mūrchhanās. In this wise the world of svaras grows to infinity, there always being notes within notes. These mūrchhanas are called laghu, guru, hrasva, ḍīrgha, pluṭa, vyāpluṭa, vyāhrasva, etc., in various orders.

The orderly utterance of these makes chhanḍah or metre, and is the subject-matter of the science of music. The essence and whole secret

---

1 For explanation of the technical terms occurring here and for further details as to how out of the primary three notes the more complicated ones arise, the reader who cannot read Samskṛṭ may consult Mr. Bhâvanrau A. Pingle's *Indian Music* (published by "The Education Society's Press," Bombay.)

of music is the fullness or perfection of sound. And as sound is (to us in the present cycle of evolution, the first manifestation of the limitless and countless wonders hidden in) the Self, therefore the realisation of the fullness of the Self is true music.[1] The exact description, in the best manner, of whatever becomes, happens, occurs, is music. Hence the aphorism of this science: The anu-kaṭhanā, rendering or description, of some bhāva, fact, occurrence, mode, mood, emotion, is song or music, gīṭa.

Three 'orders' or metres are the chief, anuṣhtup, ḍaṇḍaka and inḍra. Of these too, the first, corresponding to A, is the very first of all metres, capable of expressing all emotions.[2] The second (a kind of endless rhythmic prose, without any strict limitation of the number of syllables), corresponds to U. The third is the M. The summation of them is the chhanḍah-praḍhānam (? mere metre). By permutations and combinations of these three, endless metres arise, all being summed up in the AUM.

---

[1] So also Pythagoras. "Mathematics and Music" had to be studied before the student became the Master; the knowledge of numbers, the knowledge of sounds—these led to the knowledge of the Self. (A.B.)

[2] It is the metre in which the bulk of the older Samskṛṭ literature is written.

Rāga arises out of the use of svaras.

In application to the *Veḍas*, this science explains what the metre of a ṛk or scripture-verse is; what svaras, notes, accents, or vowel-sounds occur in it; what is the proper way to chant it and why; what results follow from its utterance or omission; what are the proper times and other circumstances for its employment; why only such and such letters of the alphabet are used in a particular ṛk and not others; why there are breaks, sṭhala-bheḍa, (?) and of what kinds, in the ṛks; what is the place of each ṛk with reference to others, and of each word within each ṛk with reference to the other words, and why; what is the relation of the verse to viḍhi (scriptural ordinance, or ceremonial rule, etc.), and so on.

This science of *Chhanḍah* applies to all the four *Veḍas*.

Metres of various kinds arise in accordance with the constitution of the atoms composing the kamalas, nerve-ganglia, spoken of before in the paragraphs on *Shikṣhā*. Hence their endlessness of number. There are two kinds of vyavahāras, (?) behavior, operation, treatment, one concerned with the varṇa, letter, the other with the māṭrā, vowel-mark; the third is the absence of both. By the permutation of the first two, 9,200,000 (nine million two

hundred thousand) varieties of metre arise, each expressing a different mutual relationship of letter-sounds and a corresponding different mood of mind or emotion.

Thus, then, the *Chhanḍah-shāsṭra* should be studied in order to understand the endless successions that prevail all over the World-process and their mutual relations. But it should also always be remembered that Brahman is in reality independent of all this verse and metre.

(vi) *Jyoṭiṣha*, 'the science of the heavenly lights,' astronomy-astrology.—Sound-words, their 'measures' and their 'potencies'.—Relation with and proportion of the atoms of the various elements.—Application of the science to practical affairs, *e.g.*, marriage.—Its three sub-divisions.

The sixth *Aṅga, Jyoṭiṣha,* deals with practical affairs (the daily business of life). In this science the shakṭi and the māṭrā of each shabḍa, sound or word, are calculated; there is so much māṭrā, measure (proportions of the various elements, also vowel-marks ?), in it, and such shakṭi, potency. The māṭrā is indicative of or in accordance with the ṭaṭṭva, the element (or elements entering into the composition of the object denoted by a word ?); such and such elements, ākāsha, vāyu, etc., are used here; according to the laws of pronunciation

such are the possibilities (of results), such is the existing condition now, such will it be later on, such was the case in the past, and so on. According to the s h a k ṭ i and the m ā ṭ r ā in the word is the result produced thereby, as is made clear by *Vyākaraṇa.* Hence is it necessary to know details about these two and their effects with reference to each word and its relation or application to or connexion with any particular action or work—all which is the subject-matter of *Jyoṭiṣha*[1].

---

[1] The reader may perhaps remember some statements, in the Introductory notes, upon the subject of the inclusion of *Jyoṭiṣha* in *Shabḍa-shāsṭra*, the science of sounds or words, generally. These pages of the text may possibly help to suggest some reason; but it is exceedingly obscure and I have translated it in very groping fashion. I have shown the original text to a modern Paṇḍiṭ of *Jyoṭiṣha* as now current in India. He can make nothing satisfactory out of it and says there is nothing of the kind in extant works. He has added however that a solitary verse is met with now and then in the older of the current works which just suggests the possibility of some treatment of such matters also, now lost, in older and inextant works. Thus, chapter viii. of the *Bṛhaj-jāṭaka* of Varāha-mihira contains the following verse: छायां महाभूतकृतां च सर्वेऽभिव्यंजयंति स्वदशामवाप्य। क्ष्मांब्वग्निवाय्वंबरजान्गुणांश्च नासास्यदृक्त्वक्श्रवणानुमेयान्॥; also two or three similar verses in the *Horā-makaran-*

This calculation extends to every atom; there is such ā k ā s h a, such v ā y u, such ṭ e j a s, etc., in such a p a r a m ā ṇ u; the proportion of this element is greater and of this other less in this

---

ḍa of Guṇâkara. The Paṇḍiṭ says that the effect of these is to suggest that 'the relative condition of the planets concerned with or influencing a person may be inferred from the condition of his sense-organs and sensations' etc. The transition to *Jyoṭiṣha* as now known and practised may be discerned in some of the later sentences, indicating the prevalence of *special elements* at special times. We have only to read 'special planets,' (as specially embodying particular elements or predominantly made up of them) in place of 'special elements' to understand the transition. This may also help us to see the distinctive significance of the opening sentence that this science deals with practical affairs; otherwise the other five also deal with practical affairs; only they do so a little more indirectly. But how understand the transition from 'sounds' to the state of the elements? Can it be that experts had made barometers and thermometers of their vocal apparatus and inferred the prevalence or otherwise of one or other from their ability or inability to utter the appropriate sound perfectly, and, conversely, after such ascertainment of the elemental conditions, performed or did not perform any particular work, especially of Veḍic ritual and chanting? Even to-day we have works like the *Svaroḍaya*, dealing with the science of breath, by which certain people (very

atom; this is an atom of only this single element; this other is composed of all; in or for this work this kind of atom is required in larger and this other in smaller proportion; and so on. After the attainment of all such knowledge by means of *Jyoṭiṣha* such words or sounds should be employed as will best accomplish the work in hand. Thus, with reference to the marriage of man and woman, for example, the following matters should be considered in the light of this science: There are such and such atoms of ā k ā s h a in the man, such in the woman; such of v ā y u; such composite ones; this is in greater propor-

---

few, and those regarded generally as cranks), guide all their actions, according as the breath is flowing through the right nostril, or the left, etc. (It is an interesting fact, by the way, perhaps not generally noted, that human beings ordinarily breathe through only one nostril at a time.) Presumably, according to the text, the 'atomic' constitution of men and women, for purposes of marriage, would be inferred from their voice, principally, and the times and seasons of birth, etc., secondarily. The Law of Analogy, manifesting in correspondences running endlessly through and threading together all departments of the World-process, and all sciences and arts—is the key to the majority of the 'fanciful' statements in the old books. For a few tables of such, see *The Secret Doctrine*, Vol. III. pp. 452, *et seq*.

tion here, this less; the power or energy or vital force of the one or the other is greater or less; of their coming together such will be the consequence, desirable or undesirable. Herein *Kāma-Shāsṭra* also should be consulted to help the final decision of *Jyoṭiṣha.* If there is an 'equality,' sāmya, parity of physical and mental temperament, gross and subtle, then alliance should be permitted; not otherwise. So, with reference to any other action, whether it should or should not be done at such a time. For this science tells us what element (symbolised by a planet in the composition of which that element predominates) prevails or is most powerful at what times or seasons, and what works are in turn connected with and depend for successful accomplishment on the predominance of which elements.

The application of this science to the *Veḍa* is as follows: In this manṭra, scripture-verse, and in this svara, note, this word or sound should be in the middle or the beginning or at the end of this word or sound (?); it has this potency and this measure; it should be pronounced with a potency governed by this element; by the utterance of such a sound-word, a potency governed by such an element and a measure containing so much of an element are produced; by the utterance of such words, governed by such elements, in such measure and with such potency, such things or words possessing such

other potencies and measures governed by such other elements are destroyed (or created, etc.).

By means of this science the potencies and measures of the word-sounds used in all the *Veḍas* are understood and mastered and it becomes possible for the knower to effect the formation, dissolution or maintenance of atoms in this s a m s ā r a.

There is a triplicity in this science also: *Phaliṭa, Gaṇiṭa* and *Pravṛṭṭiṭā.*[1] The description of the a v a s ṭ h ā, mode, mood, state, 'fruit,' result, of or to a thing or person with reference to others, is *Phaliṭa*; as, this event ought to happen now because of such and such reasons. The knowledge of the a v a s ṭ h ā, condition, its ascertainment by 'calculation,' is *Gaṇiṭa*; as, this is so and so at this time and place. *Pravṛṭṭiṭā* or 'progression' is *Sāmuḍrika,* the 'ocean-science,' which sums up all. But, verily, the Self is above and beyond all calculations.

Such, in very brief outline, are the six 'organs' or instruments, *Aṅgas,* by means and with the help of which the *Veḍas* should be studied. With reference to the appellation of organs or limbs given to these sciences, *Chhanḍah* is said

[1] *Phaliṭa* is now-a-days a synonym for astrology, and *Gaṇiṭa* for mathematics or more particularly

to be the feet of the *Veḍas* because it teaches krama, which means 'footstep' as well as 'succession'. *Kalpa* similarly is called the hands because it teaches 'arrangement' or 'formation' which is generally made with the hands. *Vyākaraṇa* is the mouth which utters the succession of sounds taught by it. *Shikṣhā* is the nose because it teaches the action (intonation ?) of those sounds. *Nirukṭa* is the ears, because thereby the meaning of others is understood and facts received. Finally, *Jyoṭiṣha* is the eyes because it shows forth all numbers and calculations.[1]

---

astronomy. The name *Pravṛṭṭiṭā* is no longer current; but *Sāmuḍrika* is, and means, to judge from the fragments available, a compound of craniology, physiognomy, cheiromancy, and so forth.

[1] The reader must have noticed that five out of the primary set of six 'subsidiary sciences' are devoted to sound, and even the sixth (*prima facie* dealing with 'light') is made to concern itself with the same to some extent. Why is so much importance given to sound? We can only make a guess. The fifth principle or 'intelligence,' manas, now predominant in humanity, corresponds to agni, the substratum of light. Hence present humanity works most with the eye and with fire-heat and electricity. In an earlier day (and perhaps to-day too), the ṛṣhis worked, it would seem, more in and by buḍḍhi-kāma, love-wisdom corresponding mainly with vāyu-

p r ā ṇ a, will, prayer and 'sound'. Developments of science may some day restore to the public the full significance of the force of 'sound' in its 'gross' and 'subtle' forms. Even to-day human beings reach each other's minds much more by sound than by sight; the visible writing has to be translated into word-sounds by the reader before it is understood. It may be that Nature-Intelligences, the gods 'presiding over' the so-called inanimate forces of nature, are also better reached by means of 'sound' than 'sight'.

SECTION III. (*Continued.*)

CHAPTER XIV.

RULES OF STUDY.

Pedagogy.—Work and waste of time; work-days and holidays.—Why.—Correspondence with cognition, etc.—Triplets.—Adjustment of lunar dates.—The importance of sound.—The three congenital debts of man.—Ways of repayment.—That to the ṛṣhis discharged by study and teaching.—Order in which the various scriptures and the subsidiary sciences should be studied.—Two principal methods of study, from above below, and from below upwards.—The one more easy and natural for young jīvas.—Why.

Sv-āḍhyāya, which ordinarily means study and a day of study, as opposed to an-aḍhyāya, non-study and a holiday, literally means 'one's own study,' the study of oneself, the study of the Self. Every effort should always be made to understand the Self, and as the study of the *Veḍas* and the *Aṅgas* is pre-eminently such effort, that study is especially designated as sv-āḍhyāya.

An-aḍhyāya is the opposite of this. Ignorance or forgetfulness of the *Veḍa* and *Veḍāṅga*, *i.e.*, the not-thinking of the Self, not turning the

face, the consciousness, inwards, this is a n-aḍhyāya, play-time, holiday. While the Self is not known and the truth not understood, so long all time is one long holiday or waste of time, the play-time of the soul, the time of self-forgetfulness.

In imitation of this real work and waste, conventional work-days and holidays are also observed by a necessary and useful custom. Thus a day's holiday after a week's study is recommended everywhere. That rest after work is necessary follows from the general principle itself of the origin and end of all things.

From the second to the seventh day of the lunar fortnight is prescribed for the study of the *Veḍas* and *Veḍāṅgas*, six days in accordance with the six permutations of cognition, action and desire. Thereafter arises need for rest and the eighth therefore is observed as a holiday. From the ninth to the fifteenth again is time for study, and the first follows as a holiday. The reason thereof is this. The ṭiṭhis, dates, are related fully and exactly to the mahā-manvanṭaras, but not so the weeks. It is true that the dates belong to the week; still, for the division of time, the dates are the more important, for extension and shrinkage occur in them only, and extension and shrinkage, expansion and contraction, increase and decrease, *are* samsāra, the World-

process.[1] If there be even a touch of the p r a ṭ i-p a ṭ, *i.e.*, the first, or sixteenth part or more of the eighth, on any day, then, by study on that day, all the learning of the student fades away like the moon in the dark fortnight. According to cognition, action, desire and the summation and the importance or quality of the dates, are s v ā ḍ h y ā y a s, etc., and subjects of study determined.

---

[1] The lunar fortnight does not always contain fifteen days, as will be said in the text itself later on; this is what is referred to by the extension or shrinkage of the lunar dates. That the lunar dates correspond with larger cycles is naturally enigmatic, but it is at the same time suggestive and an extra-mathematical astronomer may be able to make something of it. The Biblical idea of six days of creation and one of rest, the Purāṇic descriptions of s a n ḍ h i s, junction-periods, between cycles of activity and of larger periods of p r a l a y a, theosophical views as to races and rounds and intervening periods of abeyance, the number of breaths taken by a human being in the twenty-four hours (as calculated, by average, in the Samskṛṭ works on the subjects) are all similar. To a person able to discern the subtler relations and forces subsisting and operating amongst the things of the world, the statements of the text would be obviously full of meaning and of practical use. This consideration of dates for study and play is naturally connected with the subject of *Jyoṭiṣha* just

The prescribed work-days ought to be diligently taken and the holidays as diligently avoided for study. The p a r y-a ḍ h y ā y a is the equality and balance of both (? to the hierarch always 'on duty,' who has transcended subordinate rules, and from the metaphysical standpoint) in the AUM. The three respectively correspond to A, U and M. A difficulty seems to arise out of the fact that there are fifteen 'dates' (not always fifteen full days, but only 'dates') in a lunar fortnight and one out of every seven days should be a holiday, which leaves behind one odd day; but that odd day is just needed to adjust the expansion and contraction of dates mentioned before, as is explained by *Jyotiṣha*. The fortnight thus comes to be sometimes of fifteen, at others

---

dealt with, and, for the reasons mentioned in that connexion, it is plainly possible that in the universal scheme of rotation of all things and forces, certain elements may be 'in force' on certain days and specially helpful to certain studies or the opposite. In the current *Kūrma Purāṇa* there are indications that twelve different kinds of rays or forces proceed from our sun (one aspect of the 'mythos' of the twelve Āḍiṭyas) and that each is, by turn, predominant in one month; also that each is specially connected with a planet, and so on. *The Viṣhṇu Purāṇa* and the *Viṣhṇu-Bhāgavaṭa* also give many details about the special characteristics and correspondences of the twelve Āḍiṭyas.

of fourteen, and occasionally of even thirteen days only.

On similar grounds, a longer holiday, of one week, is observed every six months. When the sun turns to the north, at the makara-saṅkrānṭi, the zodiacal sign of the 'crocodile (Capricorn or He-goat)' the first week of the month is to be observed as a holiday; so, too, when it turns to the south, at the karka-saṅkrānṭi, the 'crab'. Again every three years the extra lunar month is allowed as a vacation. This extra month comes on every third year in accordance with the operations of cognition, desire and action.

The six months when the sun is in the south are connected with U or kriyā; the other six months, when it is in the north, with A or jñāna; the absence of both[1] is the M. The triennial vacation of one month is born of a sanḍhi, a junction-point of two periods or cycles, it is an extension of the time of ichchhā (holidays generally?), and Shiva is worshipped in that month, it being solely dedicated to that deity.

With respect to what is not for the sake of the Self (*i.e.*, what is for the sake of others, for the sake of helping others?) there is always 'an absence of study' allowed *i.e.*, study of books may always be given up for the sake of the study of another's welfare, that being the more

[1] Of both the declinations, apparently, and hence the solstices, or equinoxes, or both?

urgent?). Such is the custom of the wise, the shishta, the 'instructed' who have 'remained over (from previous cycles),'[1] who are devoted to knowledge and who know perfectly all about such ordinances. For such alternate periods of rest and work have been fixed by the custom of the wise for all, from Mahā-Vishṇu and the mahā-manvanṭara down to the atom and the ṭruti, by careful calculation.

The pary-aḍhyāya refers to the life and conduct of yogis and ṛṣhis and not of all people. It means the universal and constant study of the whole of samsāra. After going through svāḍhyāya and anaḍhyāya, the jīva attains to pary-aḍhyāya in which there is no thinking (no need for pondering) left (for all is already clear and well-known). The summation of these three is the samāḍhyāya.

In this wise, by study on the proper days, should the co-operation of the *Veḍas* and the *Aṅgas* be mastered. Exact knowledge of the powers of sounds is attained thereby. Sound is the quality of ākāsha and all activity here, in this particular world-system of ours, depends finally upon ākāsha (the higher or subtler elements not being yet manifest to us). Hence the need to know all about sound. Know-

---

[1] See the *Maṭsya Purāṇa*, Chapter cxlv. for this explanation of shiṣhta.

ledge of what is needful for every one in each situation is attained by means of the *Veḍa*, and by means of the force of sound residing in the manṭras should those needs be supplied. All this can be done by the proper utterance of the appropriate manṭra-sounds in the prescribed order. Widespread showers of rain, or of flowers, disappearance of undesirable substances, extermination of germs of disease, all kinds of operations of practical utility, the integration and disintegration of atoms, the production of music, the creation of gardens and the enhanced growth of plants—all this can be brought about by him who has duly studied and knows the *Veḍas*. Such a brāhmaṇa is a god on earth and does the right thing at the right time. The six operations of the (black) *Ṭanṭra*, 'fascination,' 'subjugation,' 'changing the inclination or nature,' 'destroying,' etc., are all included here; all are effected by the power of sound, for if a manṭra is uttered in the reverse order, the effect is reversed also.[1]

The study of the *Veḍas* is the repayment of the debt to the ṛṣhis. It is well-known that

[1] There is some reason to believe that the manṭras of the real White *Veḍa*, thrown out of their true order and context, have been made subservient to Black Magic, and so given rise to the horribly-obscene and orgylike and blood-shedding ritual of some of the 'sacrifices' current in the dark

every human being owes three ṛṇas or debts congenitally, to the ḍevas, to the piṭṛs, to the ṛṣhis. The first is discharged by the performance of sacrifices and the service of all beings in various ways, gifts of food, clothes, and such-like. The second is repaid by funeral oblations at shrāḍḍha, the performance of all action with the shraḍḍhā or faith that all are one.[1] The third is satisfied by study and by teaching, the giving to others of the knowledge received by oneself.

The ḍeva-ṛṇa is connected with U or action; the piṭṛ-ṛṇa with M or desire; and the ṛṣhi-ṛṇa with A or knowledge.[2]

---

days of history; and that when the ritual became confirmed in any epoch, by widespread public acceptance, then, as always, the Powers of Good tried to utilise these for kārmic purposes, for the setting free of human souls tied to animal bodies, etc.

[1] The current view is that the debt to the ancestors is repaid by the rearing of progeny and taking for them the trouble that our parents have taken for us; also, of course, by the offering of funeral oblations. The modern world is beginning to recognise the fact of such debts in a general way under the name of "the debt of the individual to Society". By and bye the three special subdivisions may come to be recognised.

[2] Sometimes, by looking at the matter from a

This study, for which the first stage of life is set apart, should be carried on in the following order. After investiture with the 'sacred thread,' the *Gāyaṭrī* should be practised. Then the ***Mahā-vākyas*** should be studied, although, of course, their full significance cannot be realised at that early stage. The *Gāyaṭrī* and the logia represent and correspond to the universal ideations, and even the mere chanting of them properly bears fruit. After these the *Aṅgas* should be studied in order. First *Vyākaraṇa*, whereby full knowledge of all words is secured. Next, *Shikṣhā*, whereby the knowledge of their use is acquired and misuse of vowel-sounds, accents, etc., avoided, as is very important, for the displacement of even one single sound from its proper position is enough to vitiate a whole operation. Thus, in the well-known case of Inḍra-shaṭru, the projection of the sound should have been in the u ḍ ā ṭ ṭ a or high accent, but was made in the a n-u ḍ ā ṭ ṭ a or low

different point of view, the ḍ e v a s are regarded as corresponding with 'intelligence' and the ṛ ṣ h i s with action. This seems to mean that the 'action,' the 'activity and functioning' of the ḍ e v a s, the 'shining ones,' makes or supplies material for our 'intelligence,' and the 'ideation,' the 'imaginative plannings out of evolution,' of the ṛ ṣ h i s guides our 'action'.

accent, so that the effect was reversed. With the high accent, the meaning of the compound word would have been 'the enemy of Indra'; otherwise, it became 'he whose enemy is Indra'. The mantra was projected for this purpose, *viz.*, that all the 'action,' kriyā of Indra should be destroyed; but by the improper pronunciation, all cognition, jñāna, of 'him whose enemy was Indra, *viz.*, Vṛṭra, was destroyed[1] (?). In the third place, *Kalpa* should be studied, whereby the subjects of knowledge are all arranged in their proper place in the scheme of all-knowledge. *Nirukṭa* should be studied after that.

---

[1] It is difficult to say exactly what this sentence means. The story is known in modern Samskṛṭ grammatical literature, and the explanation given there is different but not inconsistent. Vṛṭra was the enemy of Indra and his spiritual preceptor in pronouncing a benediction on him during a sacrificial rite preliminary to battle made the mistake of pronunciation mentioned, with the result that instead of "the enemy of Indra" prospering, it was "he whose enemy was Indra" that was to prosper. Though, of course, both expressions denoted the same person, yet, in some subtle way, it was not the active militance of Vṛṭra that was strengthened and promoted and that of Indra destroyed, but only the passive sufferance of Vṛṭra was confirmed, and the benediction fell weak and Indra prospered instead.

Then *Chhanḍah.* Finally *Jyoṭiṣha.* After these *Aṅgas*, the *Upaveḍas* together with the *Kṛṣhṇa* and the *Shukla Shākhās*; then the *Upaniṣhaṭs*; then the *Brāhmaṇas*; then the *Veḍas, i.e.*, the *Samhiṭā* proper. And, lastly, the *Mahā-vākyas* and the *Gāyaṭrī* again.

Such is the proper order of study. From the point of view of the world, the practical or empirical standpoint, knowledge grows and progresses from the grosser to the subtler. Though, in strictness, nothing precedes and nothing succeeds and all is simultaneous and universal, yet from the standpoint of the limited, there is obviously a succession, and, allowing succession, we may regard either the I as first or the This as first. In consequence of this, the method of study becomes twofold (deductive and inductive, from simple to complex and the opposite, from general to special and back again, from the one to the many and from the many to the one, from the subtler to the grosser and the reverse). The easier way for the creatures of samsāra, *i.e.*, jīvas on the 'path of pursuit' is to try to understand the Self by means of the succession of worldly things.[1] The questions and enquiries that occur

[1] The wording of the text leaves it doubtful which of the two methods is recommended as preferable. Probably, the suggestion is that a

to them first and readiest are such as these: These things that I see around me—what is their use, by whom are they governed, how do they arise and perish, in what ways do they exist and manifest and work and wear out, etc. Such considerations arise necessarily in due course (in the mind of every jīva). The human being first mainly experiences or strives after pleasure only in the first stages of life. Then he discovers that pleasure is only a form or transformation of pain; thus, the cessation or privation of a pleasure is pain and the cessation of a pain is pleasure. And this is constantly repeated, for there is nothing which has a fixed beginning and a fixed end, for all is beginningless, endless, transcendent. Now such transformation implies that there is an underlying something that is neither pleasure nor pain, but always and everywhere ānanḍa, bliss or peace. But while experience of *both* the kinds of 'transformation,' *viz.*, pleasure as well as pain, has not been

---

combination should be followed. A 'special' concrete object should be *observed* and then the 'general' *considerations* attaching to it gone through. This would be the reconciliation between the two opposed views which are causing so much disturbance in modern systems of education—(i) generalisation first or (ii) specialisation first. The details of course require working out.

had, so long as only pleasure has been felt, there is no serious reflexion about and no understanding of the process of *samsāra*. Everyone enjoys pleasure as a matter of course, as appointed by nature, as birthright. Then he experiences the other form, pain. And then only he begins to think. It is true that pain is also appointed by nature, and if it stood by itself no reflexion would arise out of it either. Reflexion arises out of a comparison of the two, pleasure and pain. Indeed, no particular knowledge of any kind can arise in a single and changeless condition. Cognition always requires two things (to delimit and define and determine each other by mutual 'negation' in greater or less degree, first the duality of seer and seen, subject and object, the one and the many, and secondly object and object; thus one sensation continued too long ceases to be felt, that is to say, the object causing the sensation loses its 'manyness' and ceases to act as foil to the 'one' self); objectivity necessarily implies 'this and thereafter this."[1]

[1] Endless examples of this truth will occur to the reader: touch a table for sometime, and, if no movement be made, the sense of contact will disappear. Hold out a hand and let a coin be placed in it, the feeling of the coin will vanish after a short time. Movement, change of some kind, is necessary for continued sensation. So also, 'another'

The mind works in the way of cognition only when there are at least two things to deal with; so long as there is only one there is no possibility of cognition. For if there were not *another* how could I say '*This alone is*,' 'I know *This*' (as distinguishable from others when there is no other). Thus, then, it is only when pain has also been experienced after pleasure that the enquiry arises: 'Alas! what is this that has followed upon my previous experience; why is not that one condition of joy alone ordained for me unchangingly; why is there another; how does the difference arise which exists between the previous experience and the present?' The jīva, harassed and depressed by these newly arisen doubts and questions endeavors to find out what is pleasure, what is pain, and what the final refuge of the bliss of peace, ānanḍa, and he makes his desire for this information known to all he comes across. Then those that possess the knowledge advise him to study the *Veḍas* and the *Aṅgas*, etc., whereby all doubts are resolved, with the help of the *Gāyaṭrī*, the logia and the Sacred Word. It is only then that the Self is seen to be not bound by pains and pleasures but

---

must be contacted ere the Self is realised, Self is only as 'another' also is. Cognition cannot be without duality and the barest awareness implies something of which to be aware. (A. B.)

above and beyond them and beyond all else besides.

This Self, Self-luminous, recks not of proof
By *Aṅga* or *Upāṅga* or by *Veḍa* ;
It is Itself the fount, the source, of all,
An Endlessness, a Blessedness immense ;
What careth It for grammar or for verse,
Or lexicon or philologic art,
Or mathematics or philosophy,
Ever at rest in Its own perfectness ;
No Shiva, Viṣhṇu, Brahmā made Its being,
Nor Mahā-Viṣhṇu helped establish It ;
Beyond them all, including endless hosts
Of all, It sleepeth in Eternal Bliss.

SECTION III. (*Continued.*)

CHAPTER XV.

THE SIX UPĀṄGAS OR ḌARSHANAS.

The *Upāṅgas*.—Their nature and relation to the *Aṅgas* and the *Veḍas*.—Their names.—Their purpose.

After the *Aṅgas* or 'limbs,' 'organs,' come the *Upāṅgas* or 'subsidiary limbs and organs,' also six in number. Their purpose is to expound in detail the final truths contained in the *Praṇava*. The essence of the *Veḍas* and the *Veḍāṅgas*, with regard to cognition, desire and action, is expanded in these in its application to the permutations of these three. U p a h [1] means proximity, approximation, the final co-ordination and synthesis of all details; that wherein this is expounded is *Upāṅga*. The *Upāṅga* can be mastered and practically realised only after and by means of the *Veḍa*, even as the *Veḍa* is mastered only with the help of the *Aṅga*. Hence the saying that the *Aṅga* is the means to the *Veḍa* and the *Veḍa* the means to the *Upāṅga*. The detailed exposition of the laws and methods of the World-process referred to in the *Veḍas* is contained in the *Upāṅgas*; and such of the

---

[1] The modern form is u p a, without the final aspirate.

inner significance of the *Veḍas* as is not dealt with in the *Upaveḍas* is also expounded in them. Abbreviation and prolixity, contraction and expansion, reduction and enlargement, abridgment and detail, involution into seed and evolution into tree, one and many—in the combination of these lies the whole activity of the World-process; and the treatises which describe that process are correspondingly aphoristic and discursive, statements of principles and statements of details. That which is expanded is necessarily capable of reduction, and *vice versa*. And yet, even so, it must be borne in mind, all these *Aṅgas*, *Veḍas* and *Upāṅgas* can but limitedly state the barest outlines of cosmic ideation, the principles common to all worlds. For indeed, the task of comprehending all the details of all possible world-systems within a limited compass is manifestly impossible, and there is a 'multiplicity in unity' *i.e.*, a whole world-system in every atom, and in each such world there are countless atoms, and numberless worlds in each again, and so on infinitely, involving infinite particular ideations.

The six *Upāṅgas* are: *Veḍānṭa*, *Mīmāmsā*, *Nyāya*, *Vaisheṣhika*, *Yoga* and *Sāṅkhya*. And they all, it should be borne in mind, are based on only one Final Truth, the Logion. It is true that the conclusions each one immediately and directly

expounds differ from those dealt with by the others; but the difference is that of supplementary parts, limbs or organs, and not that of hostile opponents. One common Universal Being underlies all; the prime object of all is to declare the I-This-Not; they name Brahman by six different names as indicating six different aspects of the same thing; the different limbs have all one common heart.

(i) The *Veḍānṭa.*—Its general purpose: the indication of all possible lines of enquiry, and the clue to the answer of each.—Its special purpose: the declaration of the nature of Man or the individual soul, God or the Universal Spirit, and Nature or the illusion of the World-process.—Certain observations as to the stage of evolution at which metaphysical enquiry arises in the human mind.

The *Veḍānṭa,* 'the end of knowledge,' comes first among the *Upāṅgas.* All jijñāsā, the wish to know, all enquiry, is initiated here; hence is it the first. It expounds the nature of the jīva or individual ego, of Brahman, the Supreme Ego or the Absolute, and of the Necessity of the two or Māyā. It thus imparts sure and certain knowledge of the Universal Trinity. Also, because the Self is the principal factor of the World-process and the *Veḍānṭa* deals with it mainly, therefore too is it called the principal

Upāṅga. All 'desire to know,' every line of enquiry, is set forth in the *Veḍānṭa*, because, as the *Brahma-sūṭra* declares[1]: The Self pursues knowledge, Self-knowledge—this is the final truth. Or, again: All enquiry whatsoever, all wish to know, all desire for all knowledge, is rooted in the Self. Thus, then, the enquiry after the name, the work, the conditions of every atom falls within the scope of the *Veḍānṭā*. It has been said: That which the students of *Veḍānṭa* declare to be B r a h m a n, That is I Myself, ever-manifest in every atom; this Āṭmā, supreme in nature, different from and yet the support and substratum of all things, this is I Myself, this am I, this am I. The word I is used here three times. The reason is this: The I is the This, the This the Not, the Not is the I and the This—these three main facts of the work of the World-process are expounded in the *Veḍānṭa*. Also that in Universal Being, of the nature of Unity, which exists in every atom, there is included all k r i y ā, activity, functioning; and in that is included all Self; and in all Self is included and inherent immanently the Trinity of B r a h-

---

[1] आत्मनो बोधानुष्ठानं सिद्धांतेति ब्रह्मसूत्रात् is the text. सिद्धांतेति is obviously a case of double coalescence of letters. The modern reading would be सिद्धांत इति. The meaning of the aphorism is far from unmistakable, and the aphorism itself is not extant.

man; and all this is dealt with in the *Veḍānṭa.* Also, again, the general as well as the special features and characteristics and the products or effects of the activity or will or functioning of each atom, and the main function, and the chief (resultant) substance or substantiality of each atom may be studied herein. (In other words, the three aspects, substance, mobility or function, and sense-quality of each atom; what principal substance or 'element' is composed of any particular kind of atom, what is its sense-quality, touch, taste, etc., and what is its action on or reaction to other substances?)

Out of such knowledge proceeds the declaration of the knowers of the *Veḍānṭa*: All this belongs to all; the individual I is of no account; the equity, equality, equilibrium or identity of all I's, all This's, and all Not's, is the universal Brahman.

Thus, then, we see that all the possible objects of knowledge constitute the subject-matter of the *Veḍānṭa,* whence the first aphorism of the *Brahma-sūṭra*: Henceforth the wish to know, the enquiry into, Brahman (in the fullness of all Its contents).

After the knowledge, *i.e.,* experience and observation of the World-process and the realisation of the fact that it is composed of pleasure and pain, arises the wish, as said at the end of the last chapter, to know and feel the unity of

Brahman (for without reduction to Unity there is no satisfactory explanation of the World-process). And with this view should the *Veḍānṭa* be studied, *viz.*, the view of reducing the multiplicity of the World-process to unity.

The matter may be looked at in another way. Instead of saying that the enquiry for Brahman arises after the observation of the World-process and of the fact that it is composed of pleasure and pain, we may say that the *Veḍas* which have been studied previously expound manyness, and these exposition should be reduced to a systematic unity, and hence the enquiry into Brahman follows after the study of the *Veḍas*. But this is not quite accurate; for the mastery of the whole of the *Veḍa*, which is the ideation of Mahā-Viṣhṇu and embodies the *Praṇava*, would already mean perfect knowledge; and therefore no enquiry can be left to make after that. A well-established conclusion of the *Veḍas* is that he who knows, knows nothing (*i.e.*, the Not); and he who knows Nothing knows all; therefore, after *finishing* the study of the *Veḍas*, no further enquiry after Brahman is left to be made or is possible.[1] It is

[1] To reconcile this with the previous statement that the *Veḍas* are means to the *Upāṅgas* we have to understand that in that statement only a *preliminary* and more or less cursory study of the *Veḍas*

possible only after entering into and observing the joys and sorrows of this world. The nature of the enquiry, the wish to know, is the wish to know the source and origin of all this duality that is observable everywhere. And this wish is justified by the fact that all and every duality necessarily implies a relation, an underlying unity. As the *Nyāya* shows, the 'many,' connected together, are always connected by and in one connecting something. Here, in the World-process, we see that every atom is related to every other, and the reason thereof is the underlying unity of Universal Being, saṭṭā-praḍhāna.[1] The exposition of this unity running through all things is the work of the *Veḍānṭa*; and, hence, the answer to all possible enquiry is (briefly and potentially) present in it.

But this is so only from the standpoint of the

---

is meant, and not their full and final understanding which is secured only when they are studied again, on a higher level, after the study and in the light of the *Upāṅgas.* We have already had in the last preceding chapter the direction that the *Gāyaṭrī* and the *Mahā-vākyas* should be studied again after the *Veḍas.* All this is only illustration of the general law of spiral progress and the absence of hard and fast definition anywhere in the region of even the most concrete particularity.

[1] Modern *Nyāya* and *Vaisheṣhika* speak of it as saṭṭā-sāmānya.

limited. Otherwise the Absolute is beyond all enquiry and declaration.

Unfixed by principles, void of details,
All-knowledge, hence unmoved by wish to know,
Self-natured, All-complete, the Not of all,
Apart from attributes, most wonderful,
Root of all *Manṭras, Ṭanṭras, Yanṭras* too,
Partless, pervading space, devoid of form,
Without taste or sound or speech or speaker,
Ever the bodied I-This-Not, the Self.



(ii) The *Mīmāmsā.*—Its three divisions: *Pūrva, Uṭṭara* and *Apara.*—K a r m a, action, the subject of the science.—*Pūrva* deals with self-referring action, birth, growth, etc.—*Uṭṭara,* with action in relation with others, ethical action.—*Apara,* with the activities that take place during pralaya.—Etymological explanations.—Triplets.—Significance of sacrificial acts.—Their subservience to m o k ṣ h a.—Allegorical and special interpretations.—Three kinds of karma having ethical consequence.

The second *Upāṅga* is the *Mīmāmsā,* reflexion, examination, 'minding' over and over again, (from man, to think) devoted to karma. And there too, we have three sub-divisions, *Pūrva, Uṭṭara,* and *Apara.* In the *Pūrva-Mīmāmsā* the internal functions, the activities dwelling in the self or directed immediately

towards or within itself are described; *e.g.*, the ways in which it enters the uterus, the conditions it passes through, the manner of its growth, its preservation and nourishment and so on. In the *Uṭṭara-Mīmāmsā* all karma whatever is described, that is to say, the operations of the jīva in external transactions with others (its dealings with or actions as affecting others, which give rise to karma in the technical sense, acts of merit or sin bearing reward and punishment). The *Apara-Mīmāmsā* describes the activities of pralaya, dissolution born of the Negation, the conditions which lead to such dissolutions and those which exist during them. These three parts or sub-divisions are obviously inter-related, and the summation of them all is the *Mīmāmsā*.[1]

---

[1] The views of the text are obviously very different from those now current. According to the latter, *Pūrva-Mīmāmsā* is *Mīmāmsā* proper, and *Uṭṭara-Mīmāmsā* is only another name for *Veḍānṭa*, while *Apara-Mīmāmsā* is non-existent. Again, the modern idea is that the *Mīmāmsā* deals only with ceremonial or ritual karma, religious rites, actions whose basic idea is that of interchange between humans and superphysical beings; whereas the text here makes karma the subject-matter of the science, in its widest possible sense and all its possible three sub-divisions, (*a*) self-evolving or psycho-physical, (*b*) ethico-religious and (*c*) self-

We thus see the trinity appearing here also as everywhere else. In the *Veḍānṭa* it consists of the question, the answer and the satisfaction (or from another standpoint, Jīva, Māyā, and Brahman, Man, Nature and God). It is the same with every *Upāṅga*. In the construction of each there appears this threefold activity corresponding to A, U, and M.

Because it deals with karma is the name *Mīmāmsā* given to this science. The syllable mī indicates mṛṭam, death, connected with Eṭaṭ, This; mā or mām is Aham, I; sā is Not, of the nature of Relation and of pralaya or dissolution (or sleep, during which power is accumulated anew for another period of activity).

All actions become (or are connected with or point to) but eṭaṭ, this. Mām's and sā's become, *i.e.*, appear and disappear in mī. The I and the Not appear and disappear only in and by action, the action of birth and death (necrobiosis, metabolism). Thus, because it deals with three kinds of activities is the Science called *Mī-mām-sā*.

As regards the common conception on the subject, it is true that the *Mīmāmsā* says that niṭya and naimiṭṭika, *i.e.*, daily and

---

involving, dissolving, potentialising and making latent.

special occasional sacrifices should be performed diligently and animals slain for sacrifice and the sacrificial meat eaten and wine drunk ritually, so that the sacrificer may enter heaven and even gain m o k ṣ h a, for drinking sacrificial wine is drinking the nectar of immortality. Still all this should be interpreted in *consonance* with the other declarations that the j ī v a attains m o k ṣ h a by k a r m a performed in accordance with duty and that duty should ever be performed with a constant reference to the All-Self and there should be no slaying, for the human j ī v a knowing all beings to be one should feel itself in every atom and love all beings always. If these statements had been really contradictory, they would not have been placed together. It is a well-established rule that opposites do not occur in the same place, in the region of the limited; though from the transcendental standpoint all exists everywhere.

It has been said that k a r m a is a means to m o k ṣ h a. But action is impossible without knowledge preceding it. So long as the j ī v a does not know what to do and how to do it he cannot act. And therefore m o k ṣ h a by means of k a r m a alone is not possible. It is possible only when the latter is conjoined with j ñ ā n a and i c h c h h ā. Yet again, k a r m a has an infinite variety, but all k a r m a does not lead

to mokṣha. It may be asked here how, when mokṣha is a thing apart, different from everything else, when it is Negation, can there arise any question of means to its accomplishment. The answer is that the Negation has in it the element of Necessity and wherever there is necessity, there the distinction between means and obstacles, facilities and hindrances necessarily arises. Thus, only those actions are means to liberation which it is necessary to perform, which are matter of duty. If all actions were regarded as equally necessary at all times, all succession could be ignored; but that is not possible from the standpoint of the limited. Everything cannot be done at once by any one. Only that should be done at any one time which it is necessary to do at that time. Looked at thus, it will be seen that havya and kavya, offerings of flesh to the gods and the manes respectively, have no connexion with mukṭi. The hanana (ordinarily, slaughter) of pashus (animals) in a yajña (sacrifice) means the *understanding* of paḍārṭhas, (things, objects, facts; the analysis, the dissection, the laying bare of the inmost nature of all animate and inanimate things, of the whole World-process in fact). The verb root han has two meanings, to slay and to approach; and the use of such a word, having two senses, in such a connexion, shows a

special purpose ; both senses should be regarded as intended, from different standpoints. In the matter of leading to liberation or to heaven, the second meaning, a v a g a m a n a, leading to, approaching, understanding, is the one intended.[1] The root g a m has four senses, (*a*) to go, (*b*) to gain deliverance (to pass away or beyond), (*c*) to obtain or reach, (*d*) to understand (to reach by the mind); and the last one is appropriate here. So, too the s u r ā recommended to

[1] The other and more literal would be the proper one in some other connexion, probably the 'black' or 'left-hand' rites; other allegorical interpretations of the sacrifices of animals, as the sacrifices of one's own animal passions, have been already referred to in the chapter on *Yajurveḍa*, III. vi. (ii) One purpose of sacrifices, with their elaborate ritual, in their other or literal interpretation, now current, is expressly declared to be to hamper and restrain and regulate the indulgence of the grosser cravings. It is much if cannibals can be induced to refrain from human flesh and to confine themselves to animal meats; much, if daily orgies can be reduced to once a year. See the *Vishṇu-Bhāgavaṭa*, XI. v. 11. The world is made up of true and false, good and evil, white and black. The Religion of All-knowledge, dealing with both, providing for souls of all grades, realising the futility of striving to abolish the evil entirely, endeavors to minimise it and gradually lead jīvas from it to the good. See Appendix at the end of this chapter.

be drunk during the Sauṭrāmaṇi sacrifice means the elixir of immortality which is the realisation of Brahman.

Māmsam[1] means the operations resulting from the moods or functionings of the mind, (mānasam) on which all achievements depend. (The other import) the actual flesh of animals is entirely forbidden, and for this reason; even as the food is, of any creature, such too is hiṣ work, such his actions, for the body is built up from the food; and as the body is, so are its functionings. Consequently the flesh of animals produces functionings and developments like theirs in the consumer. It helps on the intenser performance of physical and worldly actions (within the domain of the lower intelligence, whose function is to promote separative, individualistic

[1] Modern Samskṛṭ would not recognise this onomatopœic philology and etymology; according to it repeated mananam, thinking, is mīmāmsanam. But Manu's etymology of māmsam is in keeping with that of the text: it is that "māmsam or flesh is so called because he, saḥ, will in the future eat me, mām, whom I am eating now." See *The Secret Doctrine*, vol. ii. p. 325 (Old Edn.) as to the interpretation of the real scriptures. The text here helps us to realise how *Nirukṭa* must have been a most indispensable science for the proper understanding and the manifold interpretation of the *Veḍas*.

and material life). But subtler thinking, the following up of worlds within atoms and atoms within worlds is rendered impossible thereby. Hence the prohibition.

The ultimate conclusion of the Science of *Mīmāmsā* thus is, that karma should be ever undertaken and performed but in the altruistic spirit, with the universal consciousness, for the good of all, and that such karma only conduces to mokṣha; it, indeed, is the very realisation of Brahman.

We see then that the *Mīmāmsā* deals with karma. The exact description of all the activity present in each atom, of the everlasting behaviour of the Not-Self in short, is to be found here. This karma is, like everything else three-fold, prārabḍha, sañchiṭa, and prāpṭa.

The first is that which has been done in the past and has begun to take effect; the fruit whereof is being experienced now. It is true that "this ever-moving world is ṭāṭ-kālika, instantaneous, ever-present, an eternal now," also. But this is so only from the transcendental standpoint of the Absolute. From the standpoint of the limited, we have the succession of past, present and future, in the 'ever-moving,' of cause and effect, of act in the past and fruit in the present, or act in the present and fruit in

the future. We have examples of this all about us. A child is born this instant but cannot do the work of the world this instant; he matures gradually, passing through infancy, childhood, boyhood, youth and then only enters into business. The food taken now generates force only after assimilation. Kashāya or vairāgya too bears fruit only when 'ripe'.

Sañchiṭa is also but a variety of prārabḍha. It is the order or succession of accumulated karma present in the prārabḍha.

Prāpṭa too is but a variety of the prārabḍha. It is that which has 'arrived' or 'is approached,' is being done now; the consequences of which will be experienced in the future.[1]

---

[1] For a popular and fuller exposition of the three kinds of karma, the reader may be referred to *The Advanced Text-Book of Hinḍūism* I. iv. There are two main views on the subject of karma (as cause of births and experiences) current in Hinḍū philosophy, at the present time: (*a*) The eka-bhāvika (*Yoga-sūṭras* and *Vyāsa-Bhāṣhya*, ii. 13) and (*b*) that karma is divided up into three kinds (which are by some reduced to two, and by others increased to four). One way of describing these is that, according to (*a*), the *whole* of a jīva's past karma is summed up at each death, and takes shape as *one* effect at each new birth, and

As hinted before, the three divisions of time govern these three divisions of karma. The *Mīmāmsā* deals with all these. It describes all kinds of actions, physical and superphysical,

---

that, according to (*b*), only a portion of it called the prārabḍha is selected, by the powers concerned, and brought into play for a new birth, that the bulk is left for use in the future, as sañchiṭa, the 'accumulated,' and that the *new* karma done in the new birth is the āgāmi ('coming') or kriyamāṇa ('being done') or varṭamâna ('coming into existence') here called prāpṭa, also to fructify in the future. The difference is only apparent. The one view is true from the metaphysical or transcendental standpoint; the other, from the empirical and practical. Even in the *Yoga-Bhāṣhya*, ii. 13, referred to, distinctions are made between various kinds of karma, one taking effect forthwith, another being neutralised by or swallowed up in another, a third waiting on for fructification and so on. The reconciliation seems to be indicated by the words of the text here. Metaphysically, the *one* present (=the new birth) sums up in itself and is the *single* result of the *whole* of the past (=karma) as *one*; it also sums up in itself and is the *single* cause of the whole of the future (=phala) as *one*. But each of these three ones is a triplet, which we may perhaps describe as static, dynamic and neutral. The 'resultant of all the conflicting tendencies and forces' which make up the whole of *endless* past

including 'rites and ceremonies,' in their aspect of 'cause' of future ethical consequence in pleasure or pain of specific kinds. It also describes the groups of subsidiary and derivative actions (of the nature of 'radiating influences'

---

karma is one new life which includes the whole of *endless* future consequences—the various forces deciding amongst themselves by conflict, which shall (*a*) manifest now as consequences in the shape of joy and sorrow, which (*b*) go into latency after causing new acts, and which (*c*) remain latent—with reference to the succession of past, present and future. In other words, the *one* cause, including in itself the *succession* of all past actions, brings about the *one* effect which also includes the *succession* of all future actions; for the *order* of manifestation is also an effect. Apparently, of these three divisions of the one resultant, (*a*) those which manifest now as results, joys and sorrows, are the prārabḍha, those that have 'begun' to pass into effect, (*b*) those which remain latent and 'accumulated' are sañchiṭa and (*c*) those which cause *new* actions (under the silent pressure of the sañchiṭa) and then go into latency for future fructification in joy or sorrow are prāpṭa, the 'approaching'. In this way, prārabḍha while distinguishable from the other two, is seen also to carry both within itself. For the manifested 'living creature' embodies prārabḍha obviously and also carries in itself all its past as result and all its future as powers and potencies for good and evil act and glad and sad experience.

or 'reverberating changes,' in the language of the modern sociologist) which tend necessarily to arise out of each principal action, and their appurtenant 'experiences'. And thus the

---

In the terms of Yoga and Veḍānṭa, the manifest-sharīra may, in one view, be said to correspond to prârabḍha; the sūkṣhma-sharīra to karm-āshaya; the kāraṇa to vāsanā, and all three and any others that there may be, in summation, to aviḍyâ.

From another standpoint, we may say that sañchiṭa corresponds to the Sum-Total of Infinite Energy, static plus dynamic, which, remaining ever the same, is the one cause of all particular movements and cessations therefrom, past, present and to come; that prârabḍha is a portion of it, which, in any given time and place, is passing from the static into the dynamic condition; and that prâpṭa is another portion of it, which, similarly, in a given time and place, is passing from the dynamic into the static condition.

Prâpṭa (the arrived or approaching), âgâmi (coming), varṭamâna (existing, coming into being), and kriyamāṇa (being done) are used as synonyms. Bhâvi (to be) is sometimes added as a fourth kind. But we know that synonyms do not mean exactly the same thing. And therefore nice distinctions may be drawn with regard to all these terms.

For theoretical purposes, it is essential to bear in mind the principle that the Law of Karma is

Mīmāmsā becomes, not only a scientific manual of ethics to regulate new and future action, but also a guide-book which helps us to read past and future lives by the facts of the present, with the help of *Jyotiṣha.* But the Self transcends all this.

---

absolutely nothing else than the Law of Cause and Effect, extended to the subtler planes, astral, mental, etc., as well as the physical, and with an ethical and psychological significance in terms of consciousness added, as a common factor or co-efficient on both sides of an equation. A pleasure or a pain given becomes a pleasure or a pain received later. A pleasure or a pain given consciously becomes a pleasure or a pain received consciously. The former is the Law of Cause and Effect. The latter, the Law of Karma. In the former, the factors are *called* merely cause and effect. In the latter they are *called* merit or sin and reward or punishment. The degree of the 'consciousness' which is the common co-efficient (and the illusion of I-ness) on both sides, in the latter, is very various, ranging from the sub-conscious to clear knowledge. The details covered by this general principle must obviously be very many. Even in the domains of 'physical' science, many kinds of causes and effects are distinguished, efficient, material, final, instrumental, conditional, etc., etc. These have their place on the subtler planes as well; and others may be 'seen' from other standpoints and for other purposes.

What wotteth It of actor, acted on,
Or act in time, past, present and to come!
One Endless Cipher seems Its vast account
Of countless debts and loans and karmic bonds,
Advanced, repaid, set off, exchanged, discharged,

The *modus operandi* of the Law of Karma is the Law of Action and Re-action as well as the Parallelogram of Forces, to put it briefly and comprehensively. But here too, of course, the details are endless.

For 'practical' purposes, we may say that the whole series of births and experiences which a monad-jīva plans out for itself, from the beginning to the end of a cycle, in a world, under the guidance of its Logos or Īshvara and the total amount of energy, needed for the execution of the plans, which is taken by it from the general store of that Ruler—corresponds to the sañchiṭa. The experiences of any one particular birth and manifestation and the energy needed for it—correspond to the prārabḍha. Those of and for the next succeeding birth—to the prāpṭa; and these are seldom wholly, and may or may not be even in part, the immediate outcome of the present birth and its appurtenant energy and experiences, though these must also bear further fruit in *some* future time, and therefore are rightly called āgāmi.

For analogy, a person starts on a year's tour round the earth, with certain funds to meet expenses. He plans to visit and halt at various places

Unerring in their huge bewilderment
Of supergods and gods and nature-sprites,
Mankind and lowerkind, plants, minerals,
All bound in mutual bonds, incessantly,
Of an infinite revel of Sacrifice.

(iii). *Nyāya.*—Its main business.—The classification of all the facts of life under sixteen heads or categories, from the subjective point of view of the 'investigator'.—The explanation of each category.—Their reduction to the primal four, cognition, desire, action and summation.—The three kinds of *Nyāya.*—The uses of the study of the Science.—The Absolute.—Comparative Note on Eastern and Western 'logic'.

The third *Upāṅga* is *Nyāya*, 'bringing up, bringing together, adjusting'. Its work is n i r-ṇ a y a, 'leading out (to legitimate conclu-

---

and make various purchases and go through various experiences at each. Now the halt and the purchases at each are not the direct consequence of the halt and purchases at the preceding place—though all are more or less connected with each other. Also, in exceptional cases, as if the traveller commits a crime at one place and is thrown into prison, the whole of subsequent plans *may* be affected by a disturbance in a preceding portion. So *Manu* says: "Excessive and abnormal sin or merit bear fruit immediately (otherwise at future times in the distance)."

sion),' 'marshalling forth,' 'determination' of the exact nature of all p a ḍ ā r ṭ h a s, 'word-meanings,' 'things denoted by words,' 'imports,' *i.e.*, all objects whatsoever. The typical method of determination is this : The Self is distinguishable from the Not-Self, and the Not-Self from the Self ; yet the two are ever inseparable. Such is the s i ḍ ḍ h ā n ṭ a, the 'final and established conclusion,' a conclusion 'de-termined' by the examination (and reconciliation) of opposite views, antinomies. (In other words the business of *Nyāya*-logic is to make clear that the world and therefore everything in the world is made up of opposites, that 'every question has two sides,' and that the whole truth is always to be found in the combination of the two half-truths).[1] The *Nyāya* proves that all difference or conflict is only apparent, and that in reality all motives, causes or forces, and all things, objects or

[1] Which is exactly the reverse of what modern 'logic,' in East as well as West, tries to do. Current 'logic' only emphasises distinctions and differences. This is in accordance with the characteristic of the fifth principle or intelligence, the 'lower mind,' m a n a s—as opposed to b u ḍ ḍ h i, the higher Reason, which seeks to reconcile. This 'lower mind' appears *ethically* as 'separative egoism,' *practically* as 'the struggle for life and competition and continual conflicts,' and *intellectually* as the 'distinction-seeking logic'.

substances are one, (being only endless varieties of Self-realisation and Self-substance).

As means to this 'determination' it expounds 'the Many' under classified categories, *viz.*, (1) pramāṇa, measure, standard, evidence, means of proving or ascertaining, (2) prameya, 'the to-be-measured or ascertained,' all facts, (3) samshaya, doubt, (4) prayojana, motive, (5) ḍṛṣhtānṭa, illustration, instance, (6) siḍḍhānṭa, conclusion, etc., altogether sixteen categories. As a fact, these all are but aspects of and reducible into the ultimate four paḍārṭhas or facts; namely, cognition, desire, action and summation, the endless permutations and repermutations of which make the endless expanse of the universe.

Out of one seed grows one tree which 'expresses' 'manifests,' 'brings into experience,' all the endless potentialities of that seed, the 'many' hidden within it. This tree reproduces the 'many' as many seeds. These sprout again into new trees which show variations from the parent tree (because of the inherent manyness coming into contact with various extraneous influences in the course of 'becoming') as well as approximation to it (because of the unity of the primal seed).[1] Such is the multiplication of num-

[1] In this sentence we may find the explanation of the 'spontaneous variation' assumed by modern

bers by successive permutations. And as the earlier and nearer generations approximate to and resemble more closely the primal parent than the later and more distant ones, so this *first variation* of the penultimate four in four ways each, or sixteen altogether, is more essential than the later and more numerous. In the same way the primary variation or multiplication of three is by three, of two by two, of one by one. It is true that four may enter into parivarṭana, permutation or variation, with three or two or one; but that subserves other purposes. Thus, within the single number one, by sub-division through others, halves, thirds, quarters, we arrive at pseudo-infinity. Infinity within infinity is in the law—everywhere.

In illustration of this law, the systems of *Mahā-Nyāya*, etc., deal with one hundred or one thousand categories. We confine ourselves to sixteen, of which, again, three are chief, namely pramāṇa, prameya, and samshaya, evidence, fact, and doubt.[1]

---

evolutionists, amidst which 'natural selection' works.

[1] This is the *prima facie* order, in current experience; we (*a*) see (*b*) a thing, and (*c*) then begin to doubt what exactly it is. Then comes further investigation, or more evidence, then established conclusion; *i.e.*, doubt is the third in external experience; but in 'internal' or psychological

Pramāṇa is the element of cognition, whereby all decision takes place.

Prameya, is or corresponds to action or the Not-Self. Thus, the facing of each other by the Self and the Not-Self is cognition. The viṣhaya or object of cognition is the cognised or cognisable (and the subject, the cognisor). It may be said that cognition stands between the two as means of conjunction, and therefore these two should be mutually cognisor and cognisable to each other. But though Self and Not-Self are inseparably related, they are not identical, for if they were, then indeed there would be no relation needed at all. They are substrate and supported; similar (by mutual superimposition of attributes) but not one. Exactly equal reciprocity between them is not possible.[1] But there is an appearance of reciprocity. Because of the predominance therein of saṭṭā, being, the Self of the nature of chiṭ, becomes the cognisor; and the Not-Self becomes the cognisable because of the prevalence in it of saṭ or action. The I is the only actor, ruler, enjoyer of all things. 'I do,' 'I become,' 'I am great,' 'I am little,' 'I am thus,' 'I am otherwise'—

---

investigation, it comes first. All this corresponds to the five-step syllogism of Indian philosophy.

[1] See *The Science of Peace*, p. 203 and p. 265 for a view of the way in which the Not-Self cognises the Self.

everywhere, everywhen, everyway, only the manifestation of the I. All other things and facts are named the This. The I is the knower; the This, the known. Thus, then, cognition based on the Paramāṭmā is pramāṇa; kriyā connected with Eṭaṭ is prameya.

Samshaya, doubt, is in desire. 'Is this so or not; is this going to happen or not?' Such is doubt. And it is always based on desire, 'I wish it were so; I wish this occurred; but is it so or not; will it be so or not?' Without a wish, manifest or hidden, there is no occasion for doubt. From the transcendental standpoint, all is and happens by necessity. To introduce desire, from the personal standpoint, into this necessary succession is to create doubt. (From the ordinary standpoint also, to attach an element of desire to any course of events is to suffer anxiety and 'active' doubt, with reference to it, otherwise, when no personal interests are involved, there is 'indifference and perfect calmness and freedom from care and worry').

Such are the three main paḍārṭhas. It is true that doubt is 'no thing'. For that very reason it corresponds to M; as proof or evidence to A and fact to U. All the other paḍārṭhas are included in these three.

The summation of the three is prayojana, motive, purpose, aim, end.

Ḍ ṛ ṣ h t ā n ṭ a is included in p r a m ā ṇ a. It is the succession or successive unfolding of the latter. It is true, the N a i y ā y i k a s declare that analogies, instances, illustrations, do not suffice for complete determination (in other words, induction can never be universally exhaustive), still, whatever value it has, it has because it is of the nature of p r a m ā ṇ a.

S i ḍ ḍ h ā n ṭ a, conclusion, is similarly included in p r a m e y a; it is the succession, development, disclosing and unfolding thereof. It is the p r a m e y a that is 'concluded,' determined, established by means of p r a m ā ṇ a s, proofs, data. This 'establishment' is only the understanding of it, (the acceptance of it as fact and truth by an intelligence). For, from the standpoint of mere existence, all is s i ḍ ḍ h ā n ṭ a, even the non-s i ḍ ḍ h ā n ṭ a, or error (as it may appear to that same intelligence), for it also exists. In reality the latter is 'nothing,' naught. It thus results that a 'conclusion,' a 'judgment,' depends upon the particular necessity of particular times and successions of events. In all-time, from the view-point of the Transcendent, all possible views are true judgments. In this specified time, place and circumstance, this only is the true judgment, with reference to the need of the moment, the necessity of the circumstances, the requirements of the particular evolution and the world-system

we may be concerned with. Hence those who weigh their words well always say, "this is the right judgment, the right course to pursue, *here*;" the indication being that what is opposed to present facts may be perfectly true elsewhere.

A v a y a v a, 'limb,' 'part,' syllogistic proposition (including both kinds, premiss and conclusion, is included in Doubt. Doubt arises only in connexion with a premiss, a part, in an argument. It is only while we are dealing with the limited, with parts of the whole, that doubt is possible. When All is known, the Whole achieved, it is no longer possible. See; wherever there is 'whole'-hearted, full and complete desire for anything, that desire is necessarily and surely fulfilled. For desire itself is necessity and *vice versâ*. All things 'become,' come forth, happen by necessity, (and a desire precedes every happening). Whenever a desire remains apparently unfulfilled, the reason is that it exists only in a 'part' of the Whole, other parts having other desires and so for the time overpowering the first. If it existed in the 'whole' (of an individual, a host, a world) its fulfilment would be certain. The case of doubt is the same; the predominant facts resolve and terminate it; the unknown and subordinate ones do not receive consideration and effect.

Ṭarka, argument, reasoning from hypotheses, is connected with prayojana. Ūha, hypothesis, conjecture, theory, is made with reference to a purpose, an aim. 'How may this be secured,' 'how is this,' 'what is this,' 'if this be so, this other would be so,' 'if it were thus, such an inconsistency would result'—such is the form of ṭarka whereby a fact is determined to be 'so rather than otherwise'.

Vāḍa, discussion, falls under pramāṇa. It proceeds on the assumption that definite and provable facts, and knowledge of them, exist somewhere and in some one; and it aims at eliciting them. It is true that there are two kinds of discussion, saṭ or true and asaṭ or false.[1] But for the purposes of knowledge they are as one; it does not matter whether a fact is 'ascertained' to be true or false. (Both are 'ascertainments' and therefore useful. Destructive criticism has its uses as well as constructive).

Jalpa corresponds with prameya. It is disputation or controversy for mere display of skill and pleasure of mental activity, with much

[1] What is meant seems to be that one kind of discussion aims mainly at proving that a certain fact or rather view or opinion is true; and another kind, at proving that a certain view is false. One proves 'This is so'; another 'This is not so'. In practice, both are mixed up and supplement each other.

turning and twisting about of permutations and combinations of arguments but without any real and radical opposition. In such a disputation, each person states insistently his own side, what he has seen (with an implied suggestion that that is the *whole* of the truth, and herein is the appearance of 'dispute'. But in reality, none necessarily contradicts the other.) All-ways (motions, movements of mind here) exist in all-space and all-time; and all possible opinions may be true, in their proper times and places. Because this world is always in procession, always changing, it is always happening that one 'way' prevails 'now' and another 'then'. These changes are taking place every moment. On this understanding, controversy also is seen to have a use. It conduces to a fuller and clearer comprehension of the siḍḍhānṭa, the final truth.

Viṭanḍā, wrangling, altercation, aimless and systemless cavilling, belongs to 'Doubt'.

Nirṇaya, determination, decision, is prayojana. It is the one motive of all enquiry. And the nirṇaya of the Nature of the Self is the prayojana of all the World-process (—which is one incessant 'enquiry' into that Absolute Nature). In that final decision are determined the nature of the 'decider,' the 'decided,' the 'decision,' the 'relation' between

them, the 'ways in which separateness appears in the Tri-Unity'.

J ā ṭ i,[1] 'genus-species,' is the following up of the 'specific' separateness, the distinguishing marks of and as between atoms and atoms, things and things (species and species). The specification of denotations and connotations, the relating together of names or words with marks of and relations between things is the nature of j ā ṭ i. It belongs to p r a m ā ṇ a.

C h h a l a, 'deceit,' excuse, occasion, pretext, casuistry, sophistry comes under p r a m e y a. "If it be so, (and it is so) we ought to act thus, because of this necessity"—such is the nature of c h h a l a.

H e ṭ u, cause, reason, belongs to s a m-s h a y a. All k ā r a ṇ a s, causes, are called h e ṭ u. It is the unknown, the hidden, to be searched for, to be disclosed, to be manifested.

---

[1] The interpretation in the text, of the principal terms and subjects dealt with by the *Nyāya* is more or less different, in all cases, from that given in the works now current. But it is wholly different in the case of J ā ṭ i and the succeeding three. It is not impossible to connect the two by means of a transition through gradual changes of shades of meaning and associations. Thus at the present day, J ā ṭ i is a kind of fallacy, 'founded on false analogies'; and 'analogies' are based on 'specific characteristics' of 'species'.

"What is the reason of all this appearance, this World-process?"—such is the nature of h e ṭ u, the point in issue.

Ā b h ā s a pertains to p r a y o j a n a. Whatever 'appears,' ā b h ā ṭ i, is its own 'motive,' because all is necessary. (Every fact is its own justification; every manifestation, every appearance, is its own end, from the standpoint of the Absolute S v a b h ā v a).

Thus does the *Nyāya* 'determine' and 'prove' every thing coming within the sixteen classes or categories that exhaust all the facts of life, v y a v a h ā r a.

Nyāya also falls into three sub-divisions corresponding to A, U and M: *Ṭaṭṭva-nyāya*, *Lōka-nyāya*, and *Prashasṭa-nyāya.*[1]

In the first, corresponding to cognition, all things are examined and reduced to unity and 'identity'; I alone is, and there is no second. In the second, referring to action, 'the contradiction' and manyness inherent in the This is expounded; I is one, this is another, the relation between them is a third and so on. The third, of the nature of desire-negation, shows that All-is-Not, all undergoes change, the inner content and significance of all that appears and is affirmed, is Negation.[2]

---

[1] Not recognised by current *Nyāya*.

[2] This statement indicates that if the writer of the *Praṇava-Vāḍa* had to use modern technical language,

The unity running through these three *Nyāyas* is that they all represent distinct standpoints which all exist. From the point of view of cognition, the One I is the root and support of all the many. From that of action, there is a Multiplicity: 'Do this, and this, and this other; this is important, this is unimportant and so on'; the 'practical' conclusion belonging to this standpoint is: 'I exist only for the carrying on of the World-process'. From that of p a r i ṇ ā m a, the end, the denouement (desired or to be expected and sure to follow), change, transformation, the conclusion of both I and This is Not, of the Interplay of Self and Not-Self in any given world-system is dissolution and p r a l a y a.

From *Nyāya* we come to learn, thus, how at one epoch, the idea, the law or the consciousness of the Not-This prevails in the World-process; at another, that of the Not-Self; again, of the I only; still again, of the This only; at one time, of the 'I-This'; at another 'This-Not'; at yet another, 'I-This-Not'; and so forth. In truth,

The Self is proved by Self and not by proofs.
It is not matter for proof or doubt,

---

he would speak of the Laws of Thought as Identity, Contradiction, and *Included* (rather than *Excluded*) Middle. More on this will be found in the note at the end of this chapter.

Or varied concept, premiss, syllogism,
Deductive and inductive inference,
Hypothesis, contention, argument,
It feels no fact or motive but Itself,
The One Assurance through all fallacies.
One Unity, One only is the Self,
Yet also 'Tis a second, third, fourth, All.
All contradiction is within It hidden.
By *Nyāya* and *Veḍānṭa* is It known,
And all *Mīmāmsā* is its dwelling-place,
The Root of Being, Bliss and Consciousness,
Itself enrooted in Transcendent AUM.

NOTE: The intelligence, outward-turned, distinguishing *rather* than synthesising, endeavoring to master the details of its own world, the world of intelligence, and looking at all facts in their aspect of 'objects of investigation,' groups these outer and inner facts for its special purposes, under sixteen heads, those mentioned in the text. Other systems, from other 'points of view,' ḍarshana-bheḍa, 'leading off' from other 'points of departure,' prasṭhāna-bheḍa, behold and grasp the facts of life in other ways and aspects. Thus the *Vaisheṣhika* treats them not as 'objects of study and logical discussion,' but as in themselves, and so classifies them under six or, according to some, seven groups. The *Veḍānṭa*, as objects of enquiries subservient to the one enquiry after the Supreme. The *Mīmāmsā*, as objects of and related to action. The Yoga, as means to the evolution of the Jīva, and indirect

(iv) *Vaisheṣhika.*—The significance of the name.—The subject-matter of the system.—Its relation to *Nyāya.*—Its practical purpose.—The seven categories under which it groups all the phenomena and facts of the World-process.—Their significance.—Their origin in and correspondence with the primal triplet

---

instruments of its Release. The *Sāṅkhya* (of the *Praṇava-Vāḍa*), as embodying the Infinite and the Eternal, always, everywhere.

The sixteen heads of *Nyāya*, given here, differ from those of the current system, so far as the names go, in one small respect: h e ṭ u and ā b h ā s a are treated as one by the current system and to make up the sixteen, another head n i g r a h a-s ṭ h ā n a, is added. There are differences of interpretation also, especially as regards the latter heads. For a fair account of the main doctrines of the six systems as now current, the reader may refer to Max Müller's *Six Systems*. With reference to the principles of Logic proper, which is studied mostly by itself in modern days, but forms only a part of the philosophical system of Nyāya, a few observations may be made. The Indian syllogism has five steps instead of three. It combines, in a certain sense, both induction and deduction. Its method of induction, v y ā p ṭ i-g r a h a, is the same as the most approved modern one, *viz.*, of concomitant variations, a n v a y a-v y a ṭ i-r e k a. Its proposition or judgment or syllogistic premiss is not equational, but associative. It does not say A is B, and B is C, therefore B is C. It will say A goes

and summation.—Special consideration regarding a b h â v a or non-existence.—The three kinds or sub-divisions of the system in correspondence with the Trinity.—The Absolute.

The *Vaisheṣhika* is the fourth *Upāṅga*. That which is 'left behind' after the marking off of

---

with B, this is B, therefore A will be found accompanying this. The so-called Laws of Thought, it does not formulate in their modern form. It would probably regard them as very barren and prohibitive of all really useful or even logical operations. If A is A only and never Not-A, how can any one ever say that A is B and B is C and therefore A is C? A can be only A and never B or C, which are obviously different from A? If it were questioned as to the laws of thought it would probably refer for the answer to its sister *Veḍānṭa*, who would again very likely say that the so-called laws of thought apply only to the transcendental or metaphysical thought of or about B r a h m a n: The Self is Self alone and never Not-Self; that they are, all three, summed up in the one phrase I Not-I Not. In the region of empirical thought, on the other hand, we find everything becoming something else, moment by moment; whatever of continuity anything has, and which continuity makes any induction possible at all, is only a shadow, a reflexion, of the continuity and Unity of B r a h m a n. And the mention of the induction, and of the reason for it, in every syllogism, is intended as a standing reminder of

all others, that by which a thing is separated, distinguished, specialised from others is v i-s h e-ṣ h a. That which proceeds from or is concerned with v i-s h e ṣ h a is *Vaisheṣhika*. The enumeration of the objects of the World-process with specification of their distinctive features or

---

this fact, and as an incentive to correction of any error there might be in the induction or generalisation. The semblance of absolute completeness which appears in the major or minor premiss of modern syllogisms, and which is against fact, —since no generalisation regarding concrete particulars, by an individual human being of limited capacities, can ever be absolutely universal—is also avoided thereby. No multiplication of the finite will yield the infinite. No amount of 'repetition' of an experience can give a universal law. The reasoning is not, 'Because many times therefore always,' but 'Because once therefore always'. *Universality* of generalisation lies in the *Unity* of each instance, not in manyness. Repetitions only help us to eliminate accidental factors.

It has been claimed that Aristotle improved upon the ancient system when he reduced its five steps of a syllogism to three. This is a hallucination. He has, indeed, increased its five steps to six, for the five, as said above, include the inductive as well as the deductive syllogism.

attributes is the work of the *Vaisheṣhika* system.

It has been repeatedly observed before that all (things and thoughts) are based ultimately on the quartette of cognition, desire, action and summation. But the preliminary groupings and combinations of these primarily give rise to seven. The sixteen categories of the *Nyāya* are universal or general. The *Vaisheṣhika* deals with the special differentia or propria.[1] Without the 'general' knowledge conveyed by the former, the 'special' knowledge offered by the latter is not possible to grasp. After mastering the knowledge of those sixteen, the 'special methods' of s a m s ā r a should be studied. In this particular b r a h m ā n d a of ours, only seven p a ḍ ā r ṭ h a s are necessary (to deal with). For the knowledge of universals, *Nyāya* should be studied; for that of particulars, *Vaisheṣhika*. This is all the difference between them; otherwise, as is well-known, they are but one. Distinctions exist only as between the parts of a whole. Because of this we have the statement: Having studied the whole of s a m s ā r a according to

[1] The distinction is not quite clear. Perhaps what is meant is that the *Nyāya* categories are 'subjective,' and each and every thing may appear under all of them in succession, in various situations; while the categories of the *Vaisheṣhika* are 'objective,' and what belongs to one head cannot belong to another.

the *Nyāya* and then the *Vaisheṣhika*, create a brahmāṇḍa.

The *Vaisheṣhika* is thus the means of creating a brahmāṇḍa. Seven things are dealt with here: ḍravya or substance, guṇa or attribute, karma or motion, sāmānya or genus, visheṣha or specifying and particularising (to the extent of singularising) characteristic (of species and individual), samavāya or relation and abhāva or non-existence. Of these, the first three are the chief and respectively correspond to desire (Negation), the Self and the Not-Self.

Substance is the root and locus of all relations (which are brought about by desire). There is an apparent inversion of the usual order here. This is due to the reversal (which is unavoidable in the 'reflexion' of the attributes of Self and Not-Self in or on each other). Without substance, nothing can appear or manifest. Hence it is placed first in order. Hence too the statement that the whole of the World-process is supported and upheld by desire, which is māyā. Hence all substance is of the nature of, or is compact of, Energy, Shakṭi. All energy, desire, necessity, resides in and about substance.

So, guṇa, quality, is cognition (or cognisable; as substance is the object of desire, so quality is the object of cognition); and cognition

is Āṭmā; hence guṇa is, *i.e.*, corresponds to Āṭma.

Finally, what is done (created) is karma; and doing is action which is, *i.e.*, corresponds to Not-Self. Thus do the three paḍārṭhas correspond to M, A and U.

Then follow sāmānya, sameness, equality, similarity, the common element, genus, type; and visheṣha, speciality, diversity, particularity, individuality, singularity. Sāmānya is of the nature of the samāhāra or summation and resides in the triad of substance, attribute and motion. Because Desire, the Self and the Not-Self are all of them universal and necessary and yet one, therefore do we find that all is sāmānya, *i.e.*, is possessed of a unity in diversity which is, and is the origin of, the fact of genus. Hence people speak of a common spirit, a common desire, a common work, and, again, of so-and-so being a common or universal rule or law.

Visheṣha, the singular or particular, arises in and by the sāmānya, the universal or general, and is therefore said to be included in the latter. Visheṣha is a part of sāmānya, as sāmānya is the whole of visheṣhas.

The relation with each other, connexion or nexus between, general and special, substance and attribute, motion and motion, or motion and

any of the others, is s a m a v ā y a, 'going together,' juxtaposition, interconnextion, immanence, interdependence.

The unity of all inter-related facts, their reduction to oneness, the abolition of all differences and distinctions, is a b h ā v a, non-existence, non-becoming, non-being. Ordinarily, it is true, a totality, an agglomerate of inter-related facts implies the continued separate existence of those facts. But when the totality or unity is that of the Universal Substrate, Being, the reduction to unity will amount to non-separate-existence, *i.e.*, non-existence, a b h ā-v a (wherein all the opposing differences, the pairs of opposites, the contrasts, of which and which alone, the manifested world consists, abolish themselves mutually and leave behind only Pure Being, which may equally well be called Pure Nothing.) The a b h ā v a which is the unity or summation of the Three is 'Not-any-thing'. All this multiplicity of this, that, the other, which, who, someone, somewhere, you, I, he, etc., is possible only during b h ā v a, the existence of an inter-relation of separates. Where all is one there is neither speaker, nor speech, nor spoken to or about. A b h ā v a is generally described as 'is not'. Four kinds of this are usually distinguished, with reference to 'whole' and 'part'. They are: (i.) Previous, preceding or 'past non-existence' *i.e.*, the non-

existence of a thing in the past, before that thing came into existence; (ii.) the subsequent, succeeding or future 'non-existence of or by destruction,' the non-existence of a thing after it has been destroyed; (iii.) utter, or absolute or 'extreme non-existence'; and (iv.) 'mutual non-existence.'[1] A little consideration shows how all these are but variations of non-existence, the absence of separateness, absence of distinct manifestation, latency in the One Unmanifest. Thus 'previous non-existence' implies a consciousness, a memory, of a still earlier existence of the particular thing under reference, from which earlier existence it had passed into latency and has now reappeared. 'Non-existence by destruction' implies also that the thing has passed into the non-manifest condition out of which it will some day emerge anew into patency, for no-thing can be annihilated and every-thing must continue 'to be' in Universal Being in some way or other, and what 'becomes' or 'comes forth,' surely disappears, and what disappears as surely 'comes forth' again. 'Utter non-existence' also means only that the thing is non-existent, non-manifest to

[1] The Samskṛṭ names are, are prāg-abhāva, praḍhvams-ābhāva, aṭyanṭ-ābhāva, and anyo-ny-ābhāva. See in this connexion the last paragraphs of Section II. in Vol. I.

the senses; as a paḍārṭha, a 'meaning of a term,' a concept, a notion, an idea, it always *is*. Finally, 'mutual non-existence' means that the destruction or disappearance of one thing causes or goes together with the destruction or disappearance of another; or that the birth of one causes the death of another—as we see all about us.

Thus, then, in essence, the absence or disappearance and destruction of separateness is the real significance of non-existence.

But, in this sense, strictly speaking, abhāva is not to be counted amongst the paḍārṭhas; and the manifest World-process contains and consists of only six, ḍravya, etc., in which is included the whole of this ever-moving or manifest brahmānda, devoted to Kriyā or Karma.[1]

---

[1] It is said elsewhere that the two principal subdivisions of Karma (as mere movement, not as the ethico-psychological deeds which are the cause of pleasure or pain) are ākuñchana or contraction and prasāraṇa or expansion. On this point, compare the following: "Response, in whatever manner expressed, resolves itself into two simple and well-defined factors, namely, contraction and expansion." *Knowledge*, October 1906. p. 567—Review by G. Mason of Dr. J. C. Bose's book entitled *Plant Response as a means of Physiological Investigation*. See also *The Science of the Emotions*,

These six are divided into triplets in the usual way. (The first three with the fourth or sāmānya as summation have been already mentioned. Of the second three, sāmānya may be regarded as corresponding to A, vishesha to U and samavāya to M, the seventh or abhāva becoming the summation.) The actual concrete kinds or instances of karma and all the other padārṭhas are to be seen and understood only in the concrete or 'real' transactions and events of the World-process.

The *Vaisheṣhika* system is also threefold like the others, *Āṭma-Vaisheṣhika, Kriyā-Vaisheṣhika* and *Apara-Vaisheṣhika.*[1] The aim of the first is to unify all guṇa, the attributes of all padārṭhas. The object of the second, to unify all karma residing in 'the separate,' karma which is the basis of and is in turn based on separateness. The third deals with the completion or fulfilment, satisfaction or extinction, of all desire (ḍravya) in the one primal and eternal endeavor of Self-realisation (by means of the counterfoils of particularised substance, matter, Not-Self). These

2nd edition, pp. 165-166 ; and *Spinoza*, by J. Caird, Blackwood's Philosophical Classics, ch. xiii., p. 234, "Consciousness of self-enlargement is pleasure".

[1] Current Samskṛṭ philosophical literature does not know of these.

three correspond respectively to the A, U and M.

The *Vaisheṣhika* should be studied as a means to the realisation of the unity of Substance, Attribute and Movement, in the All-Self, and, thereafter, the mastery of the special methods of creation under the guiding principle of AUM. But in reality,

No worlds and no World-process is this Self,
Nor universal all-embracingness,
Nor special and particular is It,
But ever, every way, pure Consciousness;
No substance and no attribute is It,
Nor motion is It, nor the opposite,
But all equality, summation, One,
Awareness pure, ever and every way;
Nor is nor is not, but the sum of both,
Nor part, the positive, nor whole, the naught,
Its substance, plenitude of partlessness,
Its attribute, wareness of blessed Being,
Its movement, the eternity of rest,
Its common genus, Universal Self,
Its utmost, atomic selves, singular
Its all-embracing nexus, Unity,
And Non-Existence, Its Abode of Peace.

(v) *Yoga.*—The significance of the name.—The purpose of the science.—Its subject-matters.—Its technicalities and their interpretation.—The three kinds of *yoga*.—The Absolute.

All things 'conjoin,' 'fit together,' into each other and into One in succession—such is the significance of y o g a. And how the whole World-process, in all its parts, appropriately fits together and is inter-related—the exposition of this synthesis, this unity, this co-ordination, is to be found here. 'This enters into or exists in or comes after this, and for such and such a reason'—such is the nature of the synthesis. The projection, the fitting in, of one's own self into the Universal Self, the inspiration and motivation of the former by the latter—is the object of the science of *Yoga*. This I that seem separate, am really seated and established in and identical with the Universal I—this is the form and nature, substance and essence, of y o g a; and the practice and securing of y o g a is recommended only for the realisation of this fact. The duties, functions, operations (of all beings and forces of nature), ordained and pointed out separately (elsewhere), are all summed up and unified here; and the One is seen in all and all in One; this is the sole fruit of y o g a. The methods of these various functions and operations, and of their unification, are all described here.

The technical words of *Yoga*, p r ā ṇ ā y ā m a, etc., should be interpreted in accordance with these principles. This 'control of breath,' metaphysically and superphysically, means, essentially

the realisation of all the pseudo-infinite vital currents underlying the activities of all objects, vastest and minutest, as (being the same in nature as the operation of the life-breaths) in one's Self.

J a p a, repetition, recitation, of the AUM[1] etc., is prescribed for the same purpose. It means reflexion on, realisation of, the meaning of that which is thus uttered repeatedly. The strenuous thinking out of the universal principles included in and signified by the AUM is its j a p a. There is an order, a law, in the World-process; and the discovery of that universal law and order of all manifestation constitutes the real import and importance of the 'repetition'. And the highest end and aim of the science and art, theory and practice of *Yoga*, is the unification of all the parts in the Whole, the parts which all fall under and are also all interrelated to Unity within and by means of the AUM. The Whole and the parts are both obviously necessary. And hence are both of them but one, even though appearing as separately distinguishable during processes of description and manifestation, in language and in existence—for things which are necessary to each other are part of each other's being.

---

[1] The aphorism quoted here in the text, and explained, is the same as i. 28 of the current *Yoga-Sūtras*; the explanation is slightly different.

The three kinds of yoga are rāja hatha, and lakṣhya. The first refers to cognition, knowledge, and is the source of all 'enlightenment'. The second consists in the 'persistent practice' of various processes and methods, as means. The third is the realisation of the 'aim' of the unity of all things. These respectively correspond to A, U and M. In truth, however,

Not Yoga and not Yogin is the Self,
Not union nor disunion knoweth It,
'Not' is the I the means of any ties,
Nothing to be conjoined or to conjoin,
But e'er the Self abiding in the Not.
This Self pursueth naught, renounceth naught,
Is not perfected by oft-uttered sounds,
Or image contemplated in the mind,
Or vows and vigils, fasts, observances,
Or restful seat, or ceasing of the breath
And movement of the ever-restless mind,
Or surge of lordliness and powers divine,
Or rapt intentness, trance or ecstacy—
'Tis but the One Summation of them all.

(vi) The *Sāṅkhya*.—The etymological significance of the name.—The teaching of the system.—The Absolute.

Lastly, we come to the sixth *Upāṅga*, the *Sāṅkhya*. The numberlessness, the infinity, of all and everything is explained by it. The word

s ā ṅ k h y a means absence or transcendence of s a ṅ k h y ā or number.[1] 'Not-this,' 'not-another,' 'not-all'—such is the universal s ā ṅ k h y a, the abolition of all to which number applies. The contradiction, the opposition, the traversal and refutation of all enumeration and calculation, of all beginning and end and limitation—this is Self-knowledge according to the *Sāṅkhya*. Before me, behind me, within me, above, below, beyond—Infinity stretches everywhere.

Thus does the *Sāṅkhya* teach the transcendence of the P a r a m ā ṭ m ā, the Self, beyond all the states of Mahāvishṇu, etc. Endlessness is the very essence of this ḍ a r s h a n a, this 'view' of the World-process—without count or end in number, as also in object, aim, motive. (Nothing has in reality anything else for end and aim; all are ends to each other;[2] for everything is its own end, its own motive, because everything is

---

[1] The current explanation is different: That which carefully recognises, explains, 'enumerates,' s a m-y a k k h y ā ṭ i, the principles, ṭ a ṭ ṭ v a s, of the universe, is *Sāṅkhya*. A thing is known, is understood finally when it is 'numbered out,' interpreted in terms of mathematics; therefore s a ṅ-k h y ā comes to mean 'number,' though primarily meaning 'good knowledge'.

[2] Thus, the sensor and motor organs are means to the nutritive apparatus, and that in turn to these; and both to the organism as a whole and that to

within and is the outcome of the One Absolute, Svabhāva, Self-realising Self.) Succession is ignored by this science; and, consequently, Īshvaras and Mahāvishṇus and the endless grades beyond are all passed by, and only the Self-based, all-free Brahman as the Self embodied in the AUM is recognised.

Infinite all around, before, behind,
Above, below, within, without, beyond,
The Soul, the Self, of all the moods of Being,
Devoid even of voidness, the One Self,
One Computation in minute or vast,
An endless sigh and surge of Countlessness,
A Consciousness unconscious of all bounds.



these; and all together to the ensouling consciousness which the organism subserves as instrument of experience; and the consciousness, in turn, to the organism, for without it, the latter breaks up—and so on.

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER XV.

INTERPRETATIONS OF THE VEḌAS.

That there appear to be many ways of interpreting the *Veḍas* has been suggested more than once, in the Preface to this work, in the footnotes, and in the text itself. The current interpretation has led western scholars to characterise them (at least in parts) as "the babblings of child-humanity," as "about the silliest books that can be read" and even as "obscene orgic filth". Another method of interpretation would, it is said, yield results very different, which, if they could only be secured, would amply justify the claims of profound and all-comprehensive wisdom that is claimed for them by traditional belief. The justification of these claims is obviously impossible for a layman. The keys are not to be found by such. The lack of physical, intellectual and moral worth which has made modern mankind unfit to hold the wisdom, prevents their being entrusted with the keys.

"Then why speak of these things at all; why put forward claims which you cannot submit to test?" The reply from those who know, might well be: "We do not compel, scarcely even ask, anyone to take these things. We only give notice

and proclaim that such things *are* available in the world, and on such conditions, for those who care. If any one have developed the seed of potentiality (which exists in all) to the extent needed, then the call of the spirit, his own inner spirit, will come to him with our message, and he will fulfil the conditions and seek and find for himself. And the Guardians and Custodians of the Wisdom and of Mankind will have the satisfaction that another of their wards has attained the majority of the soul which relieves them of his burden, or, mayhap, even makes him a helper."

And with the proclamation, samples *are* offered, which may be tested to a greater or less extent. Many interpretations of allegories are given in *The Secret Doctrine*, which says expressly that the *Veḍas* are the work of Initiates and that the *Ṛg-Veḍa* especially is a veritable Manual of Occultism. *The Praṇava-Vāḍa* would add that the Initiates or Ṛṣhis belong to different groups or rays, of the 'departments' of Brahmā, Viṣhṇu or Shiva. It is also repeatedly said in *The Secret Doctrine* that there are seven keys, *i.e.*, methods of interpretation, to be applied to all real Scriptures, each yielding one valuable sense. (*S. D.* Vol. II., of p. 335 Old Ed.)

In the present work, it has been suggested in a footnote in the preceding Chapter XIV. that

change of order of context and intonations, of the m a n ṭ r a s, may give very different senses to the same words, and change them from factors in White Magic to instruments of the Black Art. In another footnote, in Chapter XV., it has been suggested that all such possibilities are dealt with in the all-inclusive *Veḍa* for good reason. In the first place, it is obviously impossible for the scientist (except by secrecy, so far as possible) to make sure that his discoveries shall not be misapplied for wrong-doing by the evil-minded. The difference between good and evil is only the difference between selfishness and unselfishness; and they shade off imperceptibly into each other, and are always, perforce, co-existent in every individual, one *predominating* at a time. In the second place, the Power Divine that is ever shaping ill deeds to good also, might well be regarded as making use of even the evil and selfish interpretations, for the purpose of gradually weening souls from still more gross forms of living.

As concrete illustration of two entirely opposite interpretations of the same m a n ṭ r a, is printed below, an abstract translation of that portion of *Bārhāyaṇa's Bhāṣhya* on the *Yajur-veḍa* which deals with it.

This Bhāṣhya is, of course, inextant; and the portion under reference was dictated to me by

Paṇḍiṭ Ḍhanarāja on the 2nd May 1910. The Preface, which was written years ago, and was printed off in 1909, says that I had not seen Paṇḍiṭ Ḍhanarāja since 1901. He suddenly turned up, at my house in Benares, on the evening of the 18th April 1910 and went off again on 3rd May 1910. In these few days I had very little opportunity of conversing with him, because of much other urgent business. But I managed to take down to his dictation the 'original' and inextant Paṭañjali's *Yoga-Sūṭras*, 501 in number, and Vyāsa's *Bhāṣhya* (also different from the current one) on *two* of these (which appear as the 50th and 51st of the second chapter of the current Sūṭras, 195 in number); some other little things; and the portion of Bārhāyaṇa's *Veḍa-Bhāṣhya*, referred to, on the m a n ṭ r a of the *Yajur-veḍa*, which, in the printed copies, appears as the 19th of the 23rd chapter—*but*, in the original, according to Paṇḍiṭ Ḍhanarāja, is the 3rd of the 6th chapter—that is to say, in an entirely different setting and context. The current interpretation, in Mahīḍhara's (printed) *Bhāṣhya*, explains it in a manner which horrifies the modern reader with its unnatural and obscene monstrosity—the chief Queen of the King who is performing the a s h v a-m e ḍ h a, seeking conception from the sacrificial horse, etc. In the older interpretation, which seems to be

drawn with the 'metaphysical' key chiefly, the manṭra-prayer becomes an act of will and yoga-meditation, an intense and efficient drawing in of inspiration and power from the Universal Fount of all Energy, for the vivification of the subtler sheaths and senses of the celebrants and the benefitting of the whole world—an interpretation obviously suited to advanced and pure souls. The other (Mahīḍhara's), suited to the jīvas at the stage of savage orgies only thinly covered with a veneer of civilisation, of surging animal passions which convert and drag intelligence down into cruel cunning and lust; jīvas who are as yet slaves as well as tyrants, fools as well as knaves, victimisers and victims in rotation, like animals —for the two are in reality one, by psychological characteristics. The Atlanteans, of the wicked portions of the Fourth Root-Race, known as the Brahma-rākṣhasas, were probably the first so to misapply the *Veḍa-manṭras.* For such, and all subsequent jīvas of the same type, the distortion and evil interpretation of the scriptures—evil, no doubt, as being a vent for orgic tendencies—is yet good in that it prevents worse and far more frequent wallowing in indulgence of such, like the animals.

The abstract translation, from Bārhāyaṇa is: "The (the celebrants, the priests, etc.) pray

for the well-being of all this world, in all its manifestations and aspects, of form, taste, smell, touch and sound .... The u ḍ ā ṭ ṭ a and the a n u ḍ ā ṭ ṭ a s v a r a s are used ... Sounds have seven potencies and five m ā ṭ r ā s (?) .... Paḍārṭhas, objects, things, are 'counted' in g a ṇ a s, groups, classes. 'Thou, the Supreme, art G a ṇ a-p a ṭ i, the Lord of all these g a ṇ a s—these precious arrays of the experiences of the world, in terms of sounds and sights and fragrances, etc. Thou art B r a h-m a n—the Truth, the Wisdom, the Everlastingness, the Lord of all counts and numbers and beyond them all. Thee we invoke ever ..... These glorious voices and forms, etc., are p r i y a, dear, to us. And Thou art the Lord of them all, and Most Beloved of all, P r i y a-p a ṭ i, being the very Self of all. Thee we invoke ever ..... These potencies of sense-experience are the n i ḍ h i, mines, the hidden treasures of the organs of sense. They are all rooted in Thee, and Thou art the Lord of them all. Thee we invoke ever .... Do Thou envelop us in Thy Glory, v a s o m a m a. Do Thou ever protect and inspire us .... But, j ā n i, I am born, g a r b h a ḍ h a m, into the womb of p r a v ṛ ṭ ṭ i, pursuit, attachment to worldly things, and its accompanying pain. Thou art not j ā s i, so born therein, m ā

g a r b h a ḍ h a m, and ever resteth in n i v ṛ ṭ ṭ i. May I therefore be soon born in Thee, and Thou in Me, so might I be identified with Thee and escape these miseries. May I merge into the Universal' .... Thus do they, by vows and vigils and y o g a-meditation, perform the a s h v a-m e d h a, the sacrifice of knowledge, for a s h v a means knowledge and the organ of knowledge, that which 'carries rapidly' the individual to any given object ....".

The *Mahābhāraṭa*, Shānṭiparva (Mokṣha-ḍharma), chapter 345 (or 338 in some editions), describes how the pervasion began of the Scripture-words, so that from pure offerings they were wrenched to mean blood-guilty sacrifices: The Ṛ ṣ h i s and the (lower) ḍ e v a s disagree; the former favor the 'bloodless' interpretation; the latter crave blood. King Uparichara-Vasu is asked to arbitrate. He decides falsely, for the ḍ e v a s; and falls into the nether regions, but expiates later. Jaina books record a very similar tradition. In Theosophical language, Atlanteans kings and priests, growing more and more corrupt, displaced the white science by the Black Art and brought about the destruction of the Race and the Continent. And what occurred then on a large scale, has occurred and is occurring again and again on smaller scales.

SECTION III. (*Continued.*)

CHAPTER XVI.

STUDIES AND SCIENCES.

The psychological state of 'freedom' gained by the study of the *Upāṅgas*.—The order in which they should be studied.—The *Fourteen Viḍyās* and their correspondences with the Trinity.—Their authors.—The characteristic distinction between the *Aṅgas* and the *Upāṅgas*.—The purpose of all this study.—Derivative sciences.—Their principal groups.—The classes of students to whom they are addressed and their subject-matter.—The two main classes of authors.—The two kinds or degrees of understanding.—The metaphysical why of mutual help and instruction.

By the study and the understanding of these six subsidiary limbs and parts of the *Veḍas*, even the last clinging touch of the notion of the Universal as something superior to the particular and singular is annihilated, for both are seen to be interdependent; all changes and transformations, permutations and combinations, high and low, vast and minute, noble and vile, are seen to be naught; and only the Self-contained, Self-complete, Absolute Nature of Brahman

remains as the Ultimate Consciousness, the Essence and the Whole of All.[1]

As regards the order in which the six ought to be studied, it is said commonly, no doubt, that the *Sāṅkhya* comes first, then *Yoga*, then *Mīmāmsā*, then *Nyāya*, then *Vaisheṣhika*, and finally *Veḍānṭa* which sums up all. But this refers only to the siḍḍhānṭa (?, the final study, the final revision and conclusion, or the order of evolution and manifestation in actual fact, of which the order of human enquiry and finding is generally the opposite, the one proceeding from cause to effect and the other from effect to cause ?).

In one sense indeed, all is first and all is last, for the World-process is one, as a whole (and is not divided up into separate and independent pieces, though the various sciences have to deal with various aspects of it severally, for purposes

[1] That is to say, he becomes mukṭa in the metaphysical or philosophical sense. Even in modern languages, the words 'emancipated,' 'free,' 'law unto himself' etc., are used in a somewhat similar sense. In the 'practical' sense, as repeatedly said, there are many grades of mukṭi. Whatever stage or plane or condition a soul has passed *through* and conquered—it may be said to have secured the 'freedom' of and from it, so that it can deal with it 'at will'. Compare the English expression "the freedom of a town".

of practical convenience). Veḍa is knowledge, and the anṭa, end, thereof is the attainment of the ṭaṭṭva, 'Thatness,' the Truth; and all the sciences lead to it; (and, therefore, in this sense, *Veḍānṭa* is all-comprehensive, it is the first study and the last and the middle also). But, generally speaking, for purposes of useful study, the order is that followed in the preceding exposition of the main principles of each, whereby the object of enquiry is outlined generally at the outset and grasped in detail at the close.

The *Veḍa* corresponds to A; the *Aṅga* to U; the *Ūpāṅga* to M. (The summation may be regarded as consisting of) the *Fourteen Viḍyās*, commonly spoken of, which really comprise the six *Aṅgas*, the six *Upāṅgas*, the group of *Samhiṭā*, *Brāhmaṇa*, *Upaniṣhaṭ* and *Kṛṣhṇa* and *Shukla Shākhā* as the thirteenth, and *A-viḍyā* Ne-science, as the fourteenth.

All the activities of the World-process are comprehended in these, and the whole of them together and interdependently constitutes the one *Veḍa*.

Their Authors too are the same as the authors of the samsāra. As that is created, so are these. Every hierarch, appointed to one department of work in the world, constructs the corresponding *Aṅga* and *Upāṅga* in order to make his own ideation clear.

Thus, the making known of i c h c h h ā, the expression and communication of desire, is the work of Shiva; he is the author of the Science of Grammar, *Vyākaraṇa.* It may be said that the business of language is with knowledge, the department of Viṣhṇu. But the point to be noted is that speech, the *use* of language, is motived by a *wish,* the *desire to communicate* what is in one's mind to another. Therefore Shiva's authorship of the Science of Grammar; for he predominates in all work of the nature of desire and he who presides over a work has to frame the rules which govern its execution. The author of *Shikṣhā,* the psycho-physics and the application of Grammar, is also Shiva. For *Shikṣhā* is instruction pertaining to objects *desirable* or otherwise. We ought to desire that which will help and to avoid that which will hinder us. Desire and aversion depend upon Necessity, the needs of our constitution; and Necessity is determined by and changes with Time; and Time resides in the Ordained Succession of the World-process. Hence *Shikṣhā* takes the form of such instruction as this, *viz.,* 'This is desirable at this time; and this other is not desirable; for such and such a reason,' and so forth. Hence the inseparable connexion between *Vyākaraṇa* and *Shikṣhā, viz.,* because of the common origin of both. *Shikṣhā* corresponds

to A; *Vyākaraṇa* to U; Utterance, Speech, to M.

Viṣhṇu is the author of the sciences of *Kalpa* and *Nirukṭa*, Methodology and Etymology both, because both are concerned with the meaning of words, and meaning, sense, denotation and connotation, is jñāna, knowledge. He who puts, introduces, veshayaṭi, meanings into words, creates relations between sound and sense, is Viṣhṇu. All words are Shiva's, dependent on or connected with desire; but they are specialised, differentiated, defined by knowledge; and hence the inseparability of word and meaning. In themselves all word-sounds are inarticulate, ḍhvani; they are made articulate only by the element of jñāna mixed with them.[1] We thus see that according as a person's intention, as his thought, is clear and definite, so is his expression thereof. It may be questioned why *Kalpa* and *Nirukṭa* are not placed first in order, when jñāna is first. The answer is that Necessity governs everything, and *Vyākaraṇa* and *Shikṣhā* are the declarors of that necessity, desire; hence, for

[1] In essence, the difference between inarticulateness and articulation is the difference between the indistinct and vague on the one side and the distinct and definite by repetition on the other. And repetition, rhythm, uniformity, system, is the reflexion of the element of unity, Self, saṭṭva and cognition on the manyness of action and desire.

practical purposes, they are given the first place. The exact order of jñāna, etc., is observed in the *Veḍas*[1] (?). But when we come to permutations, all are first and all are last.

Chhanḍah, the science of Metre, Rhythm, corresponds to the samāhāra, summation, and is the work of Mahā-Vishṇu. Chhanḍah is song; and that only is sung, or sung about, which is being felt, realised, materialised by the necessity of desire. The essence of this science is the reproduction, in its own order, of every mood and mode of the World-process in word-sounds embodying that mood. Hence the *Chhanḍārṇava* (the primal work in our world-system on that subject) is the work of Mahā-Vishṇu and describes all metres and all moods.

Jyoṭisha, the science of Light, Astronomy, Astrology (the science of all the 'lights' of

---

[1] The wording in the text is obscure. The psychological order of rotation of the three aspects of consciousness is cognition, then desire, then action, then cognition again. But the *Veḍas* are arranged as *Ṛk* (cognitional or scientific), *Yajuh* (actional or practical), *Sāma* (ethical, emotional, artistic, desiderative), *Aṭharva* (summational). And within each *Veḍa* again, the order of the sub-divisions is *Samhiṭā* (cognitional), *Brāhmaṇa* (actional or ceremonial and ritualistic), *Upanishaṭ*(desiderative), *Upaveḍa* or *Ṭanṭra* (summational).

heaven, and hence all science),[1] is the work of Brahmā. This is the science of the march of Time (and time-markers, *i.e.*, the heavenly bodies) and describes all the accompanying conditions and variations of the world-system created by him. He who creates a thing knows best and most about it.

If a distinction may be made, four of these sciences are more important than the other two,[2] *viz.*, *Vyākaraṇa*, *Nirukṭa*, *Jyoṭiṣha*, and *Chhanḍah*.

The authorship of the *Upāṅgas* or philosophies is similar. They also are classed under jñāna, ichchhā and kriyā according to their conclusions.

Veḍānṭa, dealing with the final knowledge, is the work of Vishṇu. *Mīmāmsā*, concerned with karma, of Brahmā. *Nyāya*, dealing with nirṇaya, determination, resolution, (under prayojana, motive), of Shiva. *Vaisheṣhika*

1 It may be noticed that while 'light' is the governing and predominant subject-matter of one science, 'sound' is such of all the other five—and all the other sense-qualities are yet in abeyance for purposes of scientific interpretation of aspects of the World-process in terms of theirs. The endlessness of the detail of knowledge as of everything else, is forced upon us on every side.

2 And accordingly these two have practically disappeared.

is the summation (and the work of Mahā-Vishṇu ?). These four bring knowledge of all 'action,' all processes of the universe (as distinguished from the other two which deal less with 'knowledge' than, one, with the 'means' of realisation, and, the other, with the realisation itself of Infinity). *Yoga* is the work of Brahmā; for engagement, employment, conjunction, y o j a n a, is y o g a, and Brahmā assigns to each his engagement, employment, function. *Sāṅkhya,* which teaches the infinity of infinites, is the work of Shiva; for desire-necessity is endless. For this reason, *Sāṅkhya* is also sometimes said to be a philosophy of summation. But the real summation of all these six 'views' of the World-process is the *Siḍḍhānṭa,* 'the final and established conclusion' (the Science of the Praṇava), the seventh, by Mahā-Vishṇu.

The *Aṅga* and *Upāṅga* may be distinguished thus. The former gives a knowledge only of the 'ideation' and the words that embody it. The latter explains s i ḍ ḍ h ā n ṭ a, the meaning and significance thereof. Hence is the latter known also as *Ḍarshana,* 'view,' whereby all, with its inner purpose and cause, is 'seen' and understood clearly.

The *Aṅgas* should be studied first (as explained in Sec. III, ch. xiv); then the *Upāṅgas*; and then the *Veḍas* again, together with and in the

light of the *Aṅgas* and *Upāṅgas*.

Having so enlarged his intelligence by all this study, the aspirant becomes qualified for and should engage in the work of Brahman, the righteous maintenance of the World-process, the continued turning of the wheel, for the benefit of new jīvas. Such is the net result, the practical essence and significance of all this teaching.

Derived from these *Fourteen Viḍyās* are endless other sciences; for the genesis of the sciences naturally corresponds to and is as multifarious as the departments of the World-process. Poetry and Rhetoric; Music; the whole group of the Fine and the Industrial Arts; Medicine; Handicrafts; *Purāṇas*; History; Law; etc., all these are classifiable under A, U and M, and arise according to the developments of cognition, desire, and action.

Taken in the mass, they may all be grouped into three main groups: (*a*) *Shrauṭa Ḍharma*, scriptural teaching and practice, corresponding to cognition; (*b*) *Smārṭa Ḍharma*, legal knowledge and convention, right and duty, corresponding to action; and (*c*) *Ḍharma Shāsṭra*, the science of *Ḍharma* generally, ethics, synthesising the other two and corresponding to desire. There is a fourth also, the *Siḍḍhānṭa*, the summation of them all.

The *Shrauṭa* emphasises the unity of all things, for knowledge systematises and unifies. The *Smārṭa* dwells on the separateness of each thing, (for law deals with the rights and duties of individuals as enforcible against each other). *Ḍharma Shāsṭra* determines what ought and what ought not to be done (for ethics makes the compromise between unity and separateness). It is true that, from the universal standpoint, every thing ought to be done, (for there is a reason, a cause, a justification for every course of action and every fact, "there are two sides to every question," and an element of truth on either side); at the same time, in the actual World-process, from the standpoint of succession, because of the *fact* of separate and successive actions and the *need* of characterising them distinctively, for practical convenience, in opposite ways, the distinction has to be made of actions that ought to be done, and actions that ought to be not-done, in a given time, place and circumstance. In 'reality,' ultimately, however, ought and ought not are as one. The *Siḍḍhānṭa* of all is the universality and unbroken continuity of the jīva (as one with the Praṭyagāṭmā, in consequence of which all kinds of experiences and actions, good and evil, pleasurable and painful, ought and ought not, are strung upon each in the course of endless time).

The study of *Shrauṭa* is prescribed especially for sannyāsis. In that stage of life all things have to be unified, all separateness and opposition renounced, all manyness seen as illusory, all realised as I. The *Smārṭa*, on the other hand, is study for the householder, so that he, though cognisant of the underlying unity of all, may still multiply and help on manyness, in order that knowledge, the supreme knowledge, may come to all the endless many in endless time. Hence the current saying that the Smārṭas, the observers and followers of that Ḍharma, are full of works. *Smṛṭi-Shāsṭra* deals with such subjects as these: What are limitations or restrictions; what is freedom therefrom; what are the relations between two persons in certain given situations; and why; what upāḍhis, organisms, limitations, sins, lead to what others, and what others they themselves proceed from; such a person with such an upāḍhi, may properly eat and consume such food and such other upāḍhis; such food tends to develope such and such upāḍhis and tendencies and qualities, etc. Indeed all possible matters are touched on in the *Smṛṭi*. When it is said that such and such a plant or animal is rightful food for such another, or is not, what is meant is that there is a preordained relation, between the form broken up and the

form nourished thereby, along the line of evolution, or, in the other case, there is not such a relation. Otherwise, indeed, from the standpoint of the Absolute, all can consume all, and all produce all. S m ṛ ṭ i means remembrance. The significance of naming a science by that word is that, in that science, the order in time of the various births of the j ī v a in the various types or kingdoms in the course of evolution is remembered.[1] Finally *Ḍharma-Shāsṭra* lays down with reference to their places in the scheme, of evolution, the duties of all beings, as classified under the various orders and sub-orders of the followers of the *Shrauṭa* and the *Smārṭa* respectively.

With reference to their authorship, the sciences may be classified either as Ā r c h i ṭ a or Ā r ṣ h a. All sciences indeed expound only the universal oneness in manyness and *vice versâ*. Some of these have been formulated by Mahāviṣhṇu, others by Brahmā, Viṣhṇu and Shiva, and still other (sciences and works relating to their own departments of work) by the hierarchs subordinate to them. All these are to be regarded as Ā r c h i ṭ a. Besides these are the sciences and works called Ā r ṣ h a, formulated

[1] For another interpretation, see *The Science of Social Organisation; or the Laws of Manu in the Light of Theosophy*, Lecture I .

and written mainly as subsidiary to and interpretative of the Ārchiṭa. Understanding, the comprehension of a subject, is of two kinds. One may be described as 'for oneself,' a mere following of the sense. The other is such a thorough grasp of it as brings with it the power of reproducing that understanding in another individual. In short, the maturing and perfection of the first is the second. The Ṛṣhis and Brāhmaṇas having learnt for themselves the nature of each atom of the World-process; of the Self, the Not-Self, and the Relation between them; of the origin, continuance, and destruction of all things—having learnt these from the ārchiṭa works, teach them to others in the ārṣha works, so that the knowledge and the work of Brahman may spread and continue for ever and ever. For All is One, and therefore all are interdependent, from the standpoint of the Self; while all are diverse, even though mutually expectant, from the standpoint of the Not-Self; and from the point of view of the Negation, All is independent of all.

The why and wherefore and the mode of operation of this help and teaching of one another will be dealt with in the next chapter on the Sūṭrāṭmā, the Thread-soul, the group-soul, the web or net-soul, the over-soul, as variously named, in different aspects.

CHAPTER XVII.

THE SŪṬRĀṬMĀ OR THREAD-SOUL.

The metaphysical explanation of mutual help.—The common Sūṭrāṭmā.—The One through the many.—Individualities within individualities.—The pragmatic bearing of these metaphysical considerations.—Endless progress.—Various illustrations of the idea of Sūṭrāṭmā.—Triplets of aspects.—Questions as to justification of effort and possibility of avoiding joy and sorrow.—Replies.—The three functions of the Sūṭrāṭmā.—Its distinction from the Paramāṭmā.—Its identity with the Jīvāṭmā.

(The outcome, the practical application of all the knowledge thus acquired, is and should be 'mutual help' in the daily life of the world. This leads to further considerations).

Mutual help, the notion that this person can help me, in any way, were impossible, were there no difference apparent between I and another, on the one hand; and were there no real element of union, no thread of unity, of identity, between them, along which the help could pass from the one to the other, on the other hand. Because there is no real difference of one and another, therefore for the One Self, indeed, the idea of

help, helping or being helped, is non-existent, impossible, meaningless. The thought of assistance is possible amongst selves separated and individualised by embodiment in e ṭ a ṭ s and united by the Common Self. The chaplet in which many beads are strung together on one thread is a good illustration; or the plant that bears many seeds. It is a one and a many at the same time.

By reflexion of this abstract and universal principle in every concrete embodiment thereof, a pseudo-infinite series arises. Every v y a k ṭ i, 'manifested' individuality, is also a j ā ṭ i, 'genetic,' (an archetypal idea), a genus, and *vice-versa*. In the domain of the limited and successive, whatever appears as a particular, concrete, separate, definite individual as compared with its 'higher,' vaguer, more fluid and indefinite and comprehensive 'type' or 'genus,' is also, in turn, itself such a 'type' or 'genus' to lower individuals.[1]

The Oneness that pervades and holds together a s a m s ā r a, a world-system, the being and individuality of its Mahāviṣhṇu, is its S ū ṭ r ā ṭ m ā, its group- thread- net- or web-soul. From the transcendental standpoint, the Idea expressed

---

[1] In all this we may see the 'practical' application, to superphysics, of the metaphysical (logical) principles ascertained by the *Vaisheṣhika* system.

by the *Praṇava* is the Sūṭrāṭmā of the Endless World-process as a whole.

The Sūṭrāṭmā is the regulator of the system, the organism; it is that which defines and characterises it, rules and governs it and sets the dominant law of its activities, operations, functionings. We say, 'I am a brāhmaṇa,' 'thou art a brāhmaṇa,' 'he is a brāhmaṇa'—here, brāhmaṇa, the idea connoted by the word, is the sūṭra or thread, and I, thou and he are the beads which, strung thereon, make up the rosary of the whole class or caste. It is evident here that one 'active' idea, one function, one characterising occupation or activity, makes the type or genus—'active' because existence, manifestation, realisation, act-uality, is by action. It is also obvious that in the Universal or Absolute, there can be no distinction of genus and individual or singular, but only in the particular and successive. When these words, genus and individual, whole and part, samaṣhti and vyaṣhti, are used at all in connexion with the Universal Whole, they signify only the distinction between the One and the Many. The One is the Whole, the All; imitation and reflexion thereof, by and in the successive, is the type, the genus. The many is the parts; the reflexion of this is the pseudo-infinity of manifested individuals. And all such

individuals are bound together, brought into relation and connexion with each other, in wider and wider bonds of unity, by larger and larger, more and more comprehensive 'thread-souls,' 'group-souls,' 'over-souls'. Were it not so, relations of love and hate between individuals belonging to different genuses, races, kingdoms, worlds, would not be possible (and, as a fact, do not come into play till they are brought into living relation with each other by the sweep of vitality, prāṇa-currents, of the larger individuality's consciousness, through that thread, that nerve-strand, on which both are strung. Two nations in different parts of a planet remain incognisant of and apathetic to each other, till the consciousness of the planetary hierarch sweeps through both and makes them simultaneously cognisant of and therefore at once capable of sympathy and antipathy towards each other. Without a commonness of consciousness, of pursuits, of interests, love and hate, co-operation or competition, are equally impossible).

The practical or pragmatic bearing of the above considerations is that there are in the World-process, grades after grades, stages after stages, to be passed through, endlessly. There is no finality anywhere. It can never be said by any jīva, "There is nothing more left to do after this". Nor, at the same time, on the

other hand, is any wish, any craving, any fevered effort, for any particular state, grade or office, allowable. A jīva may become a Brahmā, a Vișhņu, or a Shiva; what then? Or he may become a Mahā-Brahmā, or a Mahā-Vișhņu, or a Mahā-Shiva, or a Mahā-Ruḍra, or a Maheshvara; what even then? The 'whole of pseudo-infinite particulars' is as far from being achieved then as ever. To the view of still greater and ever greater Hierarchs they would all be as atoms are to us. Hence no craving and no competitive striving for any grade of this endless hierarchy can arise within a jīva that knows. He will only do the duty of the hour diligently, without joy or sorrow, fear of loss or hope of gain, elation or depression; for he knows that all things, all offices, all duties are equally important, none more or less than any other; that he himself is Brahman in whatsoever condition he may find himself to be in the endless curves and revolutions of the World-process; that the Wheel of All-Becoming has brought him and again will bring him each and every condition and experience, high and low, of inevitable necessity, in rotation, at some time and place or other, for karma of *every kind* must happen in the life of every jīva and bring its consequence with it unfailingly.

The idea of the thread-soul, the Sūţrāţmā,

may be expressed in other ways, as thus: The unity of this samsāra or world-system, defined and limited by one cycle, succession, order or law, by the oneness of its ruler or law-giver, its Mahā-Vishṇu, is its sūṭrāṭmā. The Mahā-Vishṇu is the sūṭrāṭmā.[1]

Or, again, it may be said, the ideation, the buḍḍhi, of Mahā-Vishṇu, that "all this world-system should be carried on by such and such methods, on such and such principles"—this is the sūṭrāṭmā. The niyama, law, ground-plan, design, architectonic, of a world-system is its

[1] This corresponds or amounts to the 'group-soul' of theosophical literature, and also to the 'oversoul' of some mystic writers of the West. Of course, distinctions may rightly be drawn between these, as also thread-soul, web of life, etc. But these distinctions are distinctions of aspect only, not of thing. Each individual, in so far as it is a continuous individuality, which, as such, manifests, time after time, in separate and successive sheaths, is a 'thread-soul'. Inasmuch as each of the sheaths of this individual, at any given time, is made up of a number of other individuals (sheaths), which he holds together, he (or it) may be called a group-soul, an oversoul. The network of the prāṇa-desire of the 'group-soul' which holds together the smaller 'individuals,' which make up the larger's body, on any plane, is the web of life on that plane. See the next footnotes also, for other aspects of the subject.

sūṭrāṭmā.[1] It should be borne in mind that every law-giver is in turn himself given a law and set a rule by a higher law-giver and ruler, and is therefore not an independent or omnipotent 'law unto himself'. Therefore is it said that every law is subordinated and subsumed under higher law; that what is law for one is not such for another; that all laws are mutually related; and so forth. (The expression 'law unto himself' has significance and truth only thus, that the Supreme Self is obviously a law unto Itself, there being none other existing beside It to set It any law; and an individual person may be said metaphorically to be a 'law unto himself' only in the aspect and to the extent of his having realised his identity with the Supreme Self).[2]

---

[1] This would correspond to the theosophical conception of 'the web of life,' the buḍḍhic network; it has to be remembered that, in a certain sense, each inner or subtler body acts as such a net or web, holder and supporter, to the particles of the next denser; and even within each body we may distinguish an inner and an outer, endlessly, (see *The Science of Peace*, p. 210, *et seq.*). The nervous system with the currents of prāṇa flowing along it, would be the physical and literal web of life of the physical body.

The aspect of the 'thread-soul'; the 'individuality' that persists birth after birth; according to

From all the above it follows that that there are sūṭrāṭmās within sūṭrāṭmās, and others within them, endlessly.

It has been said before that the brāhmaṇa-type is the thread-soul of all brāhmaṇa individuals. It is the same with each one of the three other castes. Also with each one of the kingdoms of the minerals, vegetables, animals, etc. Also, again, with each one of the endless yonis, genera or species, or sub-species, included within each. Briefly, the 'unity' of each 'pseudo-whole' is a thread-soul.[1]

---

theosophical literature the 'causal body' on which the mental, astral and physical bodies of birth after birth are strung; the kāraṇa-and-sūkṣhma-sharira of the current *Aḍvaiṭa-Veḍānṭa*—is not expressly mentioned here. But it will be seen that it is also only an aspect of the group-soul as said above. The 'simultaneous' aspect is the group-soul; the 'successive' aspect is the thread-soul. The 'web' or 'thread' is obviously made up of strands. Taken separately and successively the strands and the knots or beads through which they pass make the sūṭrāṭmā passing through many births. Taken all together they make the group-soul.

[1] See preceding notes. The 'unity' of the 'pseudo-whole' of the whole biography of a jīva through all his seven or eight hundred human births in the course of one round, is its 'causal body';

Thus then every Īshvara is sūṭrāṭmā to his world, and, in turn, is an individual jīva in the world of a higher sūṭrāṭmā. A brahmānda, a viṣhva, a jagaṭ, a samsāra, each successively corresponds to a sūṭrāṭmā.

(*a*) Devotion to Īshvara, (*b*) meditating on him as sūṭrāṭmā, endeavoring to compass the essential contents of his consciousness by means of all the arts and sciences (in the ordinary condition; and by ḍhyāna and reception of the image of that larger whole in the carefully cleaned and steadied mirror of the smaller whole, one's own chiṭṭa or mind-atom, in yoga-meditation), and (*c*) helping to carry on the work of the World-process in accordance therewith—all these things are one and the same, (that is, are the ethical, intellectual and practical aspects of one and the same state of consciousness. Devotion, wisdom, sacrifice; desire, cognition, action; emotion, knowledge, practice; religion, science-and-philosophy, altruism; these correspond and go with each other).

---

just as his astro-mental body is the 'unity' of all the changing states of his physical body in one birth, from beginning to death. If the 'principle' enunciated above is carefully borne in mind many apparent inconsistencies will be seen to be only different aspects and correspondences and reflexions of the same fact on different planes.

It may be asked here: Why is there any need to endeavor to strive after such knowledge (even ordinarily and with detachment, so to say, as distinguished from the 'fevered effort' spoken of a little while ago), seeing that everything is already provided for in the Eternal Becoming?[1] Also, to say that such knowledge brings joy and lessens sorrow does not seem correct, seeing that sorrows are experienced, as a fact, by the knower, the wise man, also?

The reply is, briefly, this: The striving is also included in and provided for and rendered necessary by the same Eternal Becoming, for every j ī v a, at the turning-point of each cycle. And the joy and sorrow that, no doubt, must continue to come to the jīva so long as it remains embodied in denser or subtler sheath, even after it has achieved the knowledge of the Self, are, yet, more chastened in their nature, and have no longer

[1] This question is but another form of the old, old doubt as to how karma (*pre-assumed* to mean overwhelming doom and fate and irresistible pre-destiny, can be reconciled with any effort at all. The reply is the true metaphysical one: If we would believe in a pre-destiny then effort is also included therein; this is true from the standpoint of the Whole. Otherwise, from the standpoint of the limited, karma is not such resistless fate, but only a limited cause, to be met with new causes, *i.e.*, efforts.

the same overwhelming power that they had before to carry him off his feet irresistibly and away from his duties. With the gain of such knowledge, the jīva attains true free-will. He becomes sva-ṭanṭra, self-dependent. He can resist surges of joy and sorrow, he can deliberately circumscribe the limits beyond which they shall not go. This is his power of avaroḍha. He can also deliberately permit himself to experience and follow them; this is anuṛoḍha. Utter lack of restraint is āroḍha. This, in an emotional reference.

Generally, the activity of a sūṭrāṭmā may be regarded as threefold: (*a*) avaroḍha, limitation, definition, of its own limits in time, space, self-definition, definition to itself of the type or aspect of the World-process that it is going to manifest, (*b*) anuroḍha, pursuing, following out, becoming, carrying out in succession, the business of the World-process in the particular aspect previously defined, (*c*) āroḍha, the disregard and negation of both these (*i.e.*, 'letting oneself go' without regard for others or for consequences, behaving as if there were no others to take into account, or, from another standpoint, behaving in a manner as if all others were so intimately interdependent with oneself that there was no need for restraint or concealment or reserve and exclusion, and no possibility

of complete de-fini-tion and severence from them in time, space and motion). These three may be regarded as respectively corresponding to A, U and M.[1]

The distinction between the Paramāṭmā and the sūṭrāṭmā may be put thus: The Three, I, This and Not, taken together in Their Infinite Significance, constitute the former; with *limited* sense, denoting and connoting particular contents, they make sūṭrāṭmās. In another way: AUM, the triune sound, utterly transcendent, indicates the former; aham-eṭaṭ-na, limitedly transcendent, transcendence on the verge of or connected with limitation is sūṭrāṭmā.

The work of sṛṣhti, 'emanation,' creation, evolution, proceeds by means of sūṭrāṭmās. In the AUM, the Paramāṭmā may be said to correspond with the A, the sūṭrāṭmā with the U, and that which is born from them, the destructible, the transient, the negatable world-systems, with the M. From another standpoint, the sūṭrāṭmā may be

[1] 'The Ring-Pass-Not,' 'Fohat,' and 'Ālaya'(?) of *The Secret Doctrine* may be regarded as aspects of these three functions of the sūṭrāṭmā. The group-soul, the thread-soul proper, and the 'web of life' may also be regarded as respectively in correspondence with A, U and M, or āṭma, manas and buḍḍhi.

said to correspond with the M, inasmuch as it is the all-pervading nexus which holds together the contents of a world-system; but here, in this particular context, emphasis is laid on its aspect of law and order, and so it is said to correspond with the U.

From all the foregoing, it will be clear that the sūṭrāṭmā itself is the jīvāṭmā.[1] And

[1] See preceding footnotes as to the 'thread-soul proper'.

NOTE:—One of the frequent charges against metaphysic is that its exponents use too many words, with too vague, indefinite, incoherent and even inconsistent ideas. This charge may or may not have some truth and value when preferred against the majority of the 'current' and 'extant' philosophies, and also those portions of works of material or physical science which deal with basic principles—for there is not much to choose between them. But when we are dealing with a teacher like Gārgyāyaṇa, with his comprehensive grasp of the infinite and the infinitesimal, his profound insight into the very heart-pulsation of the World-process, we have to apply other standards of criticism. To brush him aside with a light remark is thoughtlessly to put away from ourselves the vision of truth. When he piles up too many words, one on another, as if they were synonyms, we have to remember that though they may at first sight seem dissociated, yet a common element runs through them all and allies together their various connotations and makes them

the other penultimates, Pratyag-āṭmā, Mūla-prakṛṭi, Ḍaivī-prakṛṭi, etc., arise out of the Logion in similar fashion. In reality, however,

---

all but different aspects of one fact. When we can discover this common element, we shall find that light has been thrown simultaneously on etymological and psychological facts as parallel to each other, that philology hides a large amount of philosophy within itself. Also, as to the apparent indefiniteness of the ideas intended to be expressed, it should be understood that this is not a defect or an inability of the author, but part of the nature of the ideas themselves. If we want 'definiteness' we come at once to the sensuous, the concrete, one apart from other ones. But these we can only *sense*. If we would *understand*, understand the *relation* between discrete things of sense, we must emphasise in our consciousness the aspect of the abstract, the universal, the *common*, which also is present there, inseparably from the concrete. But this *common* element is, perforce, by inevitable nature, the *opposite* of *definite*, definite in the sensuous sense which the 'concrete mind,' the outward-turned intelligence craves after and which only it can appreciate. The nexus, that which holds together others, must always be less definite, less exclusive, less separatist than those which it holds together. Pieces of wood are definite in shape, but the water in which they all float is not so definite in shape; clouds are more definite in shape and color, but the air in which

Nor thread of life, nor flowers of births
and deaths,
Nor intertwinéd rosary of beads,
Nor genus, species, type, nor singular,

---

they all float is less so; masses of various gases are more or less definite in shape and some in color also, but the ether in which they all float is not such. Let us recognise that lack of sensuous definiteness is part of the characteristic of metaphysical ideas. The final idea, I-This-Not, is the most in-definite, and most inclusive of all opposites. But the sensuously in-definite is not non-existent. Indeed, it is more intensely existent than the definite. Ideals have the most important and far-reaching consequences. Different ideals and beliefs lead to different kinds of mokṣha. And the range of the feeling of 'personality,' from the most intensely-pointed and other-resistant condition of manas, to the widest and most all-other-embracing condition of buḍḍhi, explains all possible varieties of practice and belief. The 'Problem of Personality,' one of the most important aspects of the 'Problem of the Why and How of the World-process,' is essential to study and solve. As usual, it and the Ultimate Problem are intimately connected and throw light on each other by action and reaction. On the Path of Descent, the forthgoing, as the consciousness becomes more and more intensely attached to a more and more *definite*, concrete, clear-cut body, it becomes more and more concrete, scientific, divi-

Nor Whole, nor part, nor one, nor many is It.
Not universal, not particular,
Not limited and not unlimited,
Eternal Naught and Endless Wonderment.

---

sive, individualistic and downright and downward, in thought, emotion and action. If it endeavors to understand subjective problems at all, it takes corresponding views and declares the ultimate problem insoluble, declines to recognise Itself, commits suicide. On the other Path, that of Ascent and Inturning, it becomes more and more abstract, metaphysical, all-inclusive, universalistic and upright and upward, in thought, emotion and action. It necessarily endeavors to solve the world-problem, and always must solve it, for it has only to see Itself, which nothing can prevent its doing, once the wish to do so arises within it. To the first form, the second form will often and naturally seem too vague in thought, over-tolerant in emotion, easy-going or indolent in action, even when the behavior under judgment is the result, not of ṭamas but of saṭṭva. To the second form, if it should happen to have moved very far away from the junction-point and should have unfortunately lost (as it should not lose) memory of its own first form, that first form will appear erring and hard and restless. Thus on the 'degree' of our feeling of 'personality' depends very largely the nature of our views, especially on subjective questions.

CHAPTER XV

PENULTIMATES.

[illegible]

Penultimates.

[illegible]

(i.) PRAṬYAGĀṬMĀ.

Whatever is the content, the connotation, the significance of the I alone, pure and simple, without any limitation of 'this,' or 'thus,' or otherwise—this pure consciousness or awareness or knowledge is Praṭyagāṭmā. Sarvam praṭi añchaṭi, 'that which goes and reaches out to, towards or into, which pervades and attracts, all'—that is praṭyak. The āṭmā, the Self, which is behind and within this activity of reaching the unreached, this all-pervasion, which is the originating source and establishing maintainer of this incessant operation—that is Praṭyagāṭmā. As the *Brahma-sūṭra* says: The consciousness or knowledge of the Self alone is the consciousness or knowledge of Praṭyagāṭmā. Or as the *Sāṅkhya* declares: The form, the nature, of the I is immediate, unscreened, eternal. Or the *Nyāya*: The Praṭyagāṭmā perisheth and decayeth never, nor is it proved, accomplished or perfected[1] by apavarga, liberation.

---

and universal principle of M, is Shiva whose characteristics are described in these same words in the *Purāṇas*. He is the Lord of, and impartially helps both, the gods and the titans, the forces of good and of ill; He is the chief of the immortals, yet carries venom in His throat; and so on.

[1] This may serve as an illustration of what was

It is true that the I never stands apart from the This, at any time, yet it is distinguishable from the latter as pervading it. That the two are so distinguishable is shown by the mere fact that there are two words for them. Both are mutually dependent, each defines the other, and they cannot be separated from each other.[1] The individualisation of the I is the 'this,' and into and by the 'this'; otherwise it has no particular and manifested existence. So the individuality of the 'this' is,

---

said in the note at the end of the preceding chapter. The Samskṛṭ word is s i ḍ ḍ h a, which means *all* that the three English words convey, and a little careful examination will show that the same common skeleton-idea runs through and becomes transformed into the three different-seeming ideas signified by the three words, by means and because of new applications, associations, situations and surroundings.

[1] It may seem to the reader that certain basic facts and principles are repeated too often, almost *ad nauseam* perhaps, by Gārgyāyaṇa. But what is the very object of metaphysic? Is it not to trace all facts to *one* principle? If, so, then it is necessary again and again to return to, and start afresh in a new direction from, that principle, otherwise it will be forgotten and the reader will begin to see contradictions where there are none.

and is because of a h a m, I. In the totality, of course, I, This and Not are as one; that which the I is, that same is Not-This; that which the This is, that same is Not-I; that which the Not is, that same is I-This, *i.e.*, the identification of I and This is Not, is false, (illusory), or, in other words, the Not is Not-I-This. Thus, then, whatever, and wheresoever, appears in the World-process as the mere I, characterised by the quality of the thread of unity, that is the appearance, the form, the nature, the being of P r a ṭ y a g ā ṭ m ā.

(ii.) MŪLA-PRAKṚṬI.

The E ṭ a ṭ, the This, which is the locus, the seat of manifestation of the I, is the Not-I, the A n-ā ṭ m ā, M ū l a-p r a k ṛ ṭ i. We are now considering the This alone, purely, by itself, as the absence, the opposite, the counterfoil of the I. Such is M ū l a-p r a k ṛ ṭ i. Its essential form and nature is 'This-ness,' objectivity, the cause and means of all manifestation. The possibility of the atom-many is here; for E ṭ a ṭ is essentially many. It is true that a unity is ascribed to or at least suggested of E ṭ a ṭ too by the Self's Negation of the Many, by the Negation of it as a 'single totality' opposed to, yet by that very fact also mirroring, the Self's Unity. The Self declares eternally that Manyness altogether is not. Still,

even the mere juxtaposition of the I and the This itself gives rise to a duality. And duality is a denial of unity; it is manyness; it is the opposite of the One. Hence is Mūla-prakṛṭi inevitably and pseudo-infinitely atomic, ever more and more infinitesimal. This inmost nature of Mūla-prakṛṭi as the This, should be carefully realised within oneself. That which makes, shows forth, manifests, karoṭi, in the highest, most extensive, most long-drawn-out manner, prakarṣheṇa, what is the root, the source and origin, mūla, of everything, *viz.*, Praṭyagāṭmā—that is Mūla-prakṛṭi.

As has been declared elsewhere: Not-Selfness is Mūla-prakṛṭi. The *Brahma-sūṭra* says: The very nature of Mūla-prakṛṭi is the opposite of the Self; it is the Not-Self. The *Nyāya*: The Not-Self displays and embodies all that is the opposite of the Self. By the conjunction of the two, Praṭyagāṭmā and Mūla-prakṛṭi, there is born into manifestation all that 'appears'. "The world appears by light and darkness," as the common saying goes. Mūla-prakṛṭi corresponds to darkness; Praṭyagāṭmā to light. When the Self is seated in the Not-Self, then only is there evolution, not by either alone.

It is true that, in a sense, there cannot be any

opposition between the Self and the Not-Self, for they are both included in the Being of the Absolute, still in the actual business of the world they work interdependently, which compels the supposition, the assumption, of a difference, an opposition, between them. It is not opposition in the ordinary sense however, but a matter of necessity. The positing thereof is necessary. Were the two opposed in the ordinary sense, their mutual relativity, reciprocity, interdependence, were not possible. That which cannot perform its work, cannot achieve its object, independently of another, cannot be said to be really opposed to that other. A complete opposition in the ordinary sense would require complete independence, self-dependence. It may be said that the I *is* declared to be essentially self-dependent. No doubt, this is so. But when the I becomes qualified and characterised as the actor and has, as its very nature, to perform the work of 'becoming,' then its self-dependence becomes hidden, latent. It is obvious and patently predicable of the I only when the I is considered in itself, apart from the This and the Not. *With* reference to them, the I is also other-dependent. The This, on the other hand, is essentially and every way other-dependent. Being inseparate from the I, however, and therefore catching a reflexion of the

nature of the I, it puts on the appearance of being and may be also called self-dependent. When joined to and permeated by the I, it has the appearance of unity. Thus, then, the appearance of the opposite of oneness is the Not-Self, Mūla-prakṛṭi.

Again, in itself, this Not-Self has the condition, the essential nature, character and being of Non-being. This is its proprium when the I posits it face to face with Itself as the opposite of Itself and therefore negates it as impossible. Non-being and Never is the opposite of the I, which is the essence and the whole of Ever-Being, which is the only Being that we are aware of. But even in the *op-position* there is the *positing* of the Not-I by the I. An *positing* is *supposing*, giving of possibility. Out of this fact the Not-Self steals an ever-transient ex-istence. The I is unlimited by Time, Space and Substance (*i.e.*, Motion, for substance is realised by motion, manifests and exists in and by movement only). But these are dependent upon the I; they are all asaṭ, non-being, non-existent, essentially; and they are the whole stock-in-trade of Mūla-prakṛṭi. Thus is This both saṭ and asaṭ, being and non-being, an *appearance* of existence on a core of non-existence.

When we think of the opposition between the I and the This, the latter may appear as

something separate, but in reality they are always threaded together. As the science of grammar says, naming is impossible without duality. For naming is distinguishing, and distinguishing is of one from another. If there were only unity, speech would not be at all. Light is 'illumined' itself, in turn, is thrown into relief, made manifest, by darkness. Without darkness, light could not be even spoken of. So Mūla-prakṛṭi throws into relief Praṭyagāṭmā immanent in it. It is called the playmate of the Self. It is the other of its other. It is ananṭa, endless, pseudo-infinite, connected with and including every particular thing. All action or motion takes place herein. All *Shilpashāsṭra*, all physical art and science, is devoted to it.

The identity of I and This, it is obvious, is eternally denied. The two can never and ought never to exist simultaneously. Yet, the awareness, the consciousness, of the non-existence of the This during the existence of the I, is itself the possibility and the postulation of that This. 'I is'—this consciousness implies and includes the consciousness 'there is nothing else, other-than-I'. This (second) idea, prabodha, constitutes opposition—and the result thereof is manifest manyness. That factor, condition or moment of the Partless, Unconditioned,

Timeless, Absolute Consciousness in and out of which this notion of separateness, of something other than I, arises—that is M ū l a-p r a k ṛ ṭ i. We may take an illustration: Suppose that one individual is the sole monarch of the entire globe of the earth, c h a k r a v a r ṭ i, imperator over all. But even when this fact is recognised without dispute, even then the statement is made, "There is no *other*," or the question put, "Is there really no *other*?" The autocrat also reflects from time to time, "Is there any ruler other than and independent of me, or is there not?" Such thought, implying doubts, involves the possibility of, and forthwith creates,[1] the opposite of the oneness. For if there were no such possibility at all, then the statements, discussions, questions and reflexions would all be truly and literally useless and meaningless. And such useless and meaningless actions never take place in the world, for the reason that the I is the only actor and its actions imitate its nature of Truth and Being; or, again, because

[1] In the illustration, history shows that very autocratic rulers do 'create' very independent and rebellious subjects who start independent governments, to be again gathered up later on in a higher federation—a reflexion in concrete human affairs of the laws and principles of metaphysical psychology. (See *The Science of the Emotions*, ix.)

everything is by necessity, and what is necessary is useful and significant. In the reflexions of the monarch of our illustration there will further occur such comparisons as these, "such and such others are like me; but they are less than I am in these respects; they have not such a power, or qualification, or function; they are therefore not quite like me, not equal to me," and so forth. The I is the supreme sovereign of the illustration. The domain of his sovereignty is the This. His reflexions are all concerned with it and are of two sorts, both of the nature of doubt, '*Is* it' or 'Is it *not?*' Like the monarch, the I ponders whether another than itself has or has not existence. The supposition or im-position, upon or within its consciousness, of such hypotheses is the creation of manyness (though only for subsequent refutation).[1] In reality there is no difference,

[1] Treated in the third person, 'Is there anything else than the Self?' the problem becomes a little more distant, more difficult to solve, than when put in the first person, 'Am I anything other than I?' One way of dealing with the problem in the third person is this: Apparently there is an infinity of things other than myself around me—but, how do I know that there *really* is? My senses, eyes, ears, etc., prove their existence? But what proves the existence of these senses? Ultimately, my own knowledge, my consciousness, is the sole and solitary

no separateness, between the monarch and his domain; for the notion of the one includes the notion of the other. The v i ṣ h a y a, object, domain, field of life and activity, is included in the being of the subject. Subject and object are not apart. In this sense, there is no opposition between I and This. The notion of the This is *in* the I. And the notion is the notion of not-one, of many individuals. This manyness of s a m s ā r a is m i ṭ h y ā-p r a-p a ñ c h a, 'mythical quintuplication,' a false, an illusory, complexity and multiplicity. Herein E ṭ a ṭ is a n-a-b h i n n a, 'not-un-separate from A h a m (I=not not-I), neither separate nor non-separate. Hence is the world said to be based in unity but qualified with and manifesting in duality.

M i ṭ h y ā, false, is that which is both s a ṭ and a-s a ṭ, being and non-being. I is s a ṭ; This is a s a ṭ; the conjunction of the two is the World-process.

---

proof and guarantee to me of the existence of my senses as well as of all sense-objects, and, in the circumstances, not only the proof, but the sole support, originator, substratum of them. Hence whatever existence they have is derived from *me* and is not independent of and apart from *me*. See *The Science of Peace*, p. 143, and chapters viii. to xi. for a detailed exposition of the basic metaphysical principles touched on in the text.

The One Āṭmā, in the Many Eṭaṭ, appears as many; then it is called jīvāṭmā.

(iii.) THE NEXUS OF NIṢHEḌHA OR NEGATION.

The Nexus between the two, *viz.*, the Not or Negation, indicates their non-contradiction of unity.[1] The consciousness of this very non-contradiction of unity by the two, *i.e.*, the completed negation of manyness by oneness, in any one system, the mergence of the two into one, (or one another, or each other) is pralaya. For this reason, in the consciousness of pure unity there is nothing to speak of, no speaker, no word, no space, no time, no action, and no action lessness. The form or nature of unity is different from all these things, which have place only with reference to its opposite, the many. Where there is no many, no separateness, there no language is possible. Hence the Nexus between I and This is of the nature of Negation.

Brahman is *not* prāṇa, apāna, etc., (the five vital energies that link and hold together the constituents of the body and so are the reflexions of the supreme Energy of Negation); It is *not* ākāsha, etc., (the five known kinds of 'this,' the elements); It is *not* (any of the endless derivatives of these and their mutual

[1] Gārgyāyaṇa's language hereabouts is very compressed and obscure. I have here and there purposely retained the mannerisms of the original.

relations) food or plant or suffering or revolt therefrom, or junction or division, or knowledge or action, or I and thou and he and another, and so on. No-thing is Brahman. All this, this, this, etc., is contradiction of the unity of I and This; and such absence of unity cannot be spoken of as Brahman; it is only a part (and not the Whole.) On the other hand, the unity of the two (where the I has negated and abolished the This, and so abolished itself, for practical purposes of manifestation) is Brahman; for therein is no-distinction—well-described as I-This-Not. Brahman is neither A, nor U, nor M; It is the identity, the mutual mergence, the disappearance of A and U in M.

It may be asked why this opposition, this contradiction of unity, this manyness appears much more prominently than unity. The reply is obvious: *Appears* means manifests, and manifestation is by multiplicity. Appearance, manifestation, prominence and diversity are synonymous. Even the words 'more' and 'less' belong to the many; their significance is nothing else than 'more distinguishable, more separated off' and 'less so'. In either case, that of 'more' or that of 'less,' there is a contradiction of the Whole, the Oneness. As the *Nyāya* says: The opposite of the Whole is a part, and the synthesis, the non-opposition, the

unity (and mutual abolition) of all the parts is the Whole.

While, then, manyness is prominent and manifest, Unity must obviously be the reverse. As 'separateness' increases in a world-system, 'unity' retires more and more into concealment. The words 'extreme' etc., are now and then used to qualify and describe 'separateness'. They have always only a comparative sense, indicating graded degree, and never can have an absolute meaning. 'Extreme opposition' means only very great and much emphasised difference; 'opposition,' only ordinary difference; 'non-opposition,' slight difference.

The scriptural text, "May I, the One, become many, may I be born forth," should be interpreted accordingly. The One I thinks to and within Itself, "Am I alone, or is there anyone else also". And this very thought, implying their possibility, creates the actual appearance of many others (for to that substrate-Consciousness, possibility is equivalent to 'actual appearance'). The cause and condition and means of the final determination, 'I alone is or am,' is the ex-istence, the possibility, the false appearance, the im-position and palming off on or in the Consciousness, of 'many-others'. It is only after the possibility and then the impossibility of 'others' has been

examined and ascertained, that the proclamation can be made, 'I alone am'.

(iv.) ḌAIVĪ-PRAKṚṬI.

The Necessity of the contradiction of the unity of I and This is Ḍaivī-Prakṛṭi. It is symbolised by इ, the letter I, dwelling between A and U. When two things are based on or rooted in one, difference between them is also a matter of necessity. The unnecessary is non-existent. What exists is necessary. All Becoming is necessary. This Energy of virodha, contradiction, opposition, is Ḍaivī-Prakṛṭi. In it I and This manifest. In one view, Mūla-prakṛṭi may be said to dwell within Ḍaivī-prakṛṭi and Praṭyagāṭmā within Mūla-prakṛṭi. It is the Energy of the necessity of both. That by means of which illumination, irradiation, play, takes place, ḍīvyaṭe anayā, that is ḍaivī. Prakṛṭi is sva-bhāva; becoming, causing to be, bhāvanam, by one's own effort, sva-yaṭnena—this is sva-bhāva; it is doing or acting, pra-karaṇam, *naturans*, by one's self. And the action of all and everything is the action of the Self.

The Energy of the conjunction or combination, yoga, of I and This, is Yoga-Māyā. As the *Yoga-sūṭra* says: There is an appearance of conjunction between subject and object as between light and darkness. The necessity of

the manifestation of opposition between them, on the other hand, is Māyā. That which lights up and throws into relief both I and This, and is inside of and immanent in both is Ḍaivī-Prakṛṭi. In its transcendent and universal aspect it is Māyā. In a description of the World-process, as the necessity of the contradiction of the unity of I and This, it is Ḍaivī-Prakṛṭi.

The reason why Ḍaivī and Mūla are both called Prakṛṭi is that the former has the appearance of being nearer to the latter than to the Self. In one sense, indeed, it may be said that it is peculiarly the Necessity of This; that the Necessity of I is 'another,' anyaṭ; Prakṛṭi, (aparā ?); and that of Negation, still 'another' anyaṭ (Parā?). In reality, Prakṛṭi is necessity, of nature, character, being. Everything acts, behaves, happens of itself, because of the essential necessity of its nature, in the deepest sense.

Both these Prakṛṭis, Ḍaivī and Mūla belong to the Āṭmā, which is ever Self-determined. That which is different from the Āṭmā, is its non-existence, Not-I, and it is born of the necessity of the nature of the I itself; but as the product is This, that necessity may also be called the necessity of This. Differences of names naturally arise out of differences of

situation. In its transcendental aspect, Mūla-prakṛṭi is Anāṭmā; in a limited samsāra, it is Mūla-prakṛṭi; in a brahmānda, Aparā-prakṛṭi. So, the universal and transcendent aspect is Māyā; that shown in a samsāra, Ḍaivī-prakṛṭi; that in a brahmānda, Parā-prakṛṭi. So, the all-transcendent aspect of the Self is called Aṭmā, pure and simple; in contradistinction from and with a comparative reference to limitations, to upāḍhi-sheathed selves, it is the Paramāṭmā, or Supreme Self; with reference to the network of laws, the warp and woof of regulation and administration, it is the Sūṭrāṭmā; as pervading all activity, it is Praṭyagāṭmā; as experiencing that activity, it is jīvāṭmā; and so on endlessly.[1]

[1] The reader may be reminded here of the necessity of "pursuing the thought through the word" and not allowing himself to be perplexed by the same word being apparently used in different senses. If he has at all touched the truths that everything is everywhere and always, that different situations bring out different aspects of one and the same thing, like the ever new forms assumed by the *same* few pieces of colored glass in a kaleidoscope, that the same names indicate principles as well as particular individuals, officers, hierarchs concretely embodying those principles—then he will find the

In reality, however, there is no separateness, no difference, no distinctions:

Not other, nor un-other, neither far,
Nor near, nor yet Root-Nature, nor Divine,
Not atomed Matter, nor Necessity,
Nor Energy of Being or Non-being,
Not Māyā and not Yoga-māyā too,
Not Might, nor Wish, nor All-pervading Self,
Nor Self drawn into or from All, nor Pure,
Nor Not-Self, nor Embodied, nor Supreme,
Nor the World-process, nor transcending it,
Nor any one World-system, one brahmānd',
One jagaṭ, vishva, or one mahā-vishva,
Loka or mahā-lok' of endless grading,
Nor same, nor different, separate or one,
Nor time, nor space, nor substance infinite,
Nor pure, nor full of stains, nor One nor
  Many—
But All at once, ever and everywhere,
An ever Restless Rest of I-This-Not.

---

text not perplexing but most suggestive and illuminating. Some of the technical words mentioned in the text here are explained at length in subsequent chapters, in new aspects.

SECTION III. (*Continued.*)

CHAPTER XIX.

THE JĪVĀṬMĀ.

The jīvāṭmā a compound of I and Not-I.—Etymological significance.—Its main characteristics.—Atomicity and continuity.—Embodiment of oppositions and contradictions.—Its psychological stages: nescience, science, omniscience.—Its grades, one within another, endlessly.—Progress and regress, evolution, etc., the reflexion of the simultaneous All in the successive.—Philological illustrations.—The origin of I, You and He.—Correspondences of various deities, hierarchical and divine Powers and Intelligences, with various letters of the alphabet.

The jīvāṭmā is a mixture of 'portions' of the I and the This. That wherein the Āṭmā, the Self, plays, jīvaṭi, krīḍaṭi—that is the jīvāṭmā. This jīvāṭmā is the reflexion, the image, the praṭi-bimba of the Īshvara who is the sūṭrāṭmā. It is true that the jīvāṭmā is declared to be Brahman also. But this is so only when it has achieved knowledge of its-Self, when it knows the essential and true and whole nature and character of the World-process, the I, the This, the Becoming, the To-Be, etc. Then difference between jīvāṭ-

mā, Praṭyagāṭmā, sūṭrāṭmā, Paramāṭmā, aṇu, paramāṇu,[1] etc., ceases; all merge into Brahman. An element of Na, the Negation, is also present in the jīvāṭmā, working within the elements of I and This, as the *Brahma-sūṭra* says. It is because of this that we see existence and non-existence, birth and death, succeeding one another, in it. This jīvāṭmā is an aṇu, an atom, and also partless, at the same time. Its atomicity is praṭyakṣha, 'before the eye,' patent; and it may be said, in consequence, that it is impossible for it to be partless; yet this partlessness belongs to it by virtue of its Āṭmā-nature.[2] This-ness, eṭaṭ-ṭva, is nothing else

[1] It will be noticed that some of these words are commenced with capitals and others with small letters, although in this context all signify principles. The reason is that some of the words mean only principles, and are always used in the *singular number* only; these begin with capitals. The others indicate principles as well as concrete embodiments, and occur in the plural number too.

[2] This is another of those frequent instances in which the work draws, from certain data, conclusions exactly the reverse of those that might be expected, *prima facie*, by the inalert reader! The reason is, of course, that the author sees, in the data, elements which the unprepared reader does not. "Everything contains within itself its own

than the opposite of the unity of the I. This opposition is a matter of the Necessity of the Sva-bhāva of the I. Because of it the Universal I acquires and puts on individuality. 'I' is or am one I; 'You' is or are another I; 'He' is another I. And so on, endlessly. Because each I, as I, is a continuum, an unbreakable thread or line of consciousness, the jīvāṭmā is partless and indivisible. Because, on the other hand, eṭaṭ is the opposite of unity, there arises in it atomicity, limitation, parts. Atomicity is the embodiment of the opposition between Aham and Eṭaṭ.

It must be remembered, however, that 'opposition,' 'an opposite,' cannot *really* arise in the Full and the Eternal. It is only hypothesised, postulated, imagined, fancied, dreamed, supposed, assumed for the moment, for purposes of argument, so to say, only in order to be the more effectually refuted, negated, abolished, proved to be non-existent. Duality is a necessary hypothesis *within* the One, for the sole and very purpose of emphasising the Oneness

---

opposite"—this is the governing law of logic and thought, and of fact and the whole World-process. The 'reconciliation' of the 'paradox' in the text is that the indivisibility of the atom is comparative, relative to one world-system, plane, etc., no concrete particular atom being really absolutely and finally indivisible.

of the One, in and by and through its, the duality's, own refutation and repudiation.

We see in the jīvāṭmā pleasure and pain, joy and sorrow, also that it is born, lives, dies. But all this is illusion, bhrama. The act called birth and the power of achieving it; the act called death and the power of achieving it; the act called living and the power of achieving it—all these are in the One Paramāṭmā. How do these variations arise? Thus:[1] It knows Itself as partless, conditionless, universal, transcendent; and It says to Itself, "I-This-Not". Such is Its very Nature. As I, It is unborn, undying, unopposed, unopposable, One without a second. As Eṭaṭ, It is doer, actor, sufferer, Many, diverse. As Not, It merges I and This into One or rather the Numberless. Thus indeed are all possible natures, characters, constitutions, and all power to do or not to do, or to do otherwise, already and always in the Supreme Self. Indeed the Paramāṭmā may be said to be the Totality of all these Powers. (All these are simultaneous in the Absolute). The life of the jīvāṭmā is governed by this same Supreme

[1] The argument may not appear quite clear; it is put in very compressed form with steps omitted. If the reader is interested in entering into the subject fully, he may perhaps find it useful to look through pp. 125, 126 *et seq.* of *The Science of Peace.*

Notion, I-This-Not (in the succession of its parts, however). As a l p a-j ñ a, 'little-knower,' (at first, when *identifying* itself with an e ṭ a ṭ) it thinks and believes to itself, "(I am mineral; I am plant; I am animal; I am human); I am glad; I am sad; I am good; I am virtuous; I am poor; I am nothing at all;" etc. This is the condition of a-j ñ ā n a, non-knowledge. Dissipating this error, this ne-science, and producing j ñ ā n a, knowledge, science, there arises, (in the second half of the j ī v a's life, when it begins to apply and realise the Not to and in the This) the reflexion: "All this world-happening is by Nature, by Necessity; I am nothing; thou art nothing; there is nothing mine or thine or another's; there is no difference between me, thee and another; all are and is One I".

(The first stage of the j ī v ā ṭ m ā has been described as that of the a l p a-j ñ a, the 'little-knower,' of a-j ñ ā n a, ignorance; and the second stage, by contrast, as of j ñ ā n a, knowledge, science. Is this science equal to omniscience, then?) In the strict sense, the j ī v ā ṭ-m ā, as such, must be always a l p a-j ñ a, 'little-knowing,' and only the P a r a m ā ṭ m ā, all-knowing. In the latter only is present the Whole of the I and the Whole of the This; never in any one j ī v ā ṭ m ā. (But, generally speaking, so far as the j ī v ā ṭ m ā is and realises

itself as Paramāṭmā, it takes on the potential omniscience belonging to the latter.)

For this same reason, from another standpoint and in another aspect, it appears and happens that what is eternal, simultaneously all-including, ever-present, immediate knowledge in the universal Paramāṭmā, unfolds as time-governed, successive, and partial memory in the jīvāṭmā.

This op-position and non-opposition, viroḍha and a-viroḍha (separation and identification between I and This) is an endless process. We find here the root, the seed, the germ and primal principle of all an-avasṭhā, 'non-finality,' *progressus et regressus ad infinitum*. There are atoms within worlds, and worlds within atoms, pseudo-infinitely,[1] (in Space). And within each atom ever goes on the process, first, 'I (am) this' and then '(I am) not (this)'.

Yet again, every jīva has to work out and realise this Idea of the Logion, I-This-Not, in every atom, which is another source of yet another pseudo-infinity (in Time).

Yet again (because there are jīvāṭmās within higher or larger jīvāṭmās, *i.e.*, sūṭrāṭmās), we have knowledge within knowledge, memory of memory, word inside word, dialect through dialect, language out of

---

[1] See Fournier's *Two New Worlds*, (1908).

language, meaning hiding meaning—and so on, endlessly (in Motion), an infinity of infinities.

All this regulation and demarcation of time and space that we see, the divisions into cycles and orbits, and yugas and manvanṭaras and mahā-manvanṭaras—all this is only from the standpoint of the successive, of single world-systems only.

In verity, there is no succession and no number, but only the One, Ever-present, Universal Thought everywhere; and truly is each and every jīvāṭmā eternally seated, omnipresently, in all samsāras. Only when it believes itself limited, does it endeavor to progress step by step by expanding its knowledge, its consciousness, little by little.

Ever and everywhere and every way, in every point of time and space, in every atom, shines the Self. Nothing is anywhere without the Self, dead, uninspired by It. And thus, again, we see there is no difference. The 'you' is 'I,' and the 'I,' 'you'. Whatever even hints at any separateness is but mere words that passingly deal with the possibility of a break in the Self's unity.

(An illustration of how the idea works out in the science of sound-language, grammar, may be given). The pronoun Asmaṭ means Āṭmā; Ushmaṭ is the Eṭaṭ born from it (in modern

Samskṛṭ, Yu ṣ h m a ṭ, because of the inclusion of the letter 'I,' signifying S h a k ṭ i, in it, I-U ṣ h m a ṭ becoming Y u ṣ h m a ṭ by the rules of coalescence). (The letter) 'I' is the Necessity that stands between the two, with a special abode in the E ṭ a ṭ. Hence there is a coalescence between the 'I' and 'U'-ṣ h m a ṭ.[1] But, then, why is not this fact brought out in the constitution and 'appearance' or form of the sacred sound, AUM, itself? Because, in the ultimate reality, Necessity belongs to and is *hidden* in the All, and not attached to any one of the Three in particular. Hence, the *Veḍa*-grammar, *Prāṭishākhya,* separates the 'I' out of both A and U. (The peculiar manner in which the 'I' is included in the AUM brings out the underlying principles of metaphysic.) अ, A, followed by इ, I, coalesces with it into ए, É. That followed by उ, U, merges with it into अय्, Ay. But here the य्, Y, disappears in accordance with the rules of *Veḍa*-grammar and leaves behind only the अ, A, again, and this

[1] If the reader remembers Paṇḍiṭ Ḍhanarāja's early doubts and queries as to why the Samskṛṭ alphabet was arranged as it was in Pāṇini's *Sūṭras*, he will find here an illustration of the kind of answer needed. The paragraph in the text explains why the first aphorism *should* run in the order it does. The reader may consult the *Shiva-sūṭra-vimarshinī*.

merges with the succeeding, उ, U, into O; so that AUM, is pronounced as OM. It is true that, ordinarily, a second coalescence does not take place after a lopa, disappearance, of a letter; but this rule applies to secular speech, not vaiḍika, scriptural.

With reference to such etymological considerations as these has it been said that A is Viṣhṇu, 'I' is Shaṅkara, U is Brahmā and M the Negation of all. Here 'I' is declared to be Shiva only because Shiva is connected with ichchhā, desire, which is Shakṭi. Elsewhere, A is Āṭmā, jñāna, cognition, high and low; 'I' is Shakṭi; U is all kriyā over which Brahmā presides; while Shaṅkara is M. As the four letters A, U, M and I have been here successively shown to be present in the AUM, so the *Kalāpa-Vyākaraṇas,* Encyclopædic Grammars (?) systematically explain and derive all letters, all words, and all 'meanings' and concepts out of the AUM; and the *Shilpas,* practical sciences or arts, expound all substances or paḍārṭhas, and their actions, activities, movements, functions and all natural processes too, as derived from it.[1] Truly is the AUM all-

[1] Thus, if we had these old works, we would probably find that the manifestation of the 'I' after the 'A'; their coalescence into Ē; then the manifestation of U; and their coalescence into Ay; then the dis-

comprehending. This world, and the world beyond, and the one beyond that again and so on ever endlessly, all these are present in it. None is there to compass and describe its Greatness in its entirety. What is said here is only some of the main Ideas comprised within it.

---

appearance of the Y, etc., etc., all corresponded with stages and formations and lapses, etc., in the processes of embryological and cosmological development and evolution, on the microcosmic and macrocosmic scales. And so with all the letters. (See the Introduction to the *Bhagavaḍ-Gīṭā*, by Annie Besant and Bhagavân Ḍâs, and the *Science of Peace*, pp. 160-161).

CHAPTER XX.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE JĪVĀṬMĀ.

Unification or mutual inclusion of opposites.—Love and Hate.—Two kinds of each, (*a*) General, latent and causal, (*b*) Special, patent and effectual.—The significance of 'organisation'.—Higher and higher organisms including lower and lower, endlessly.—Subsumption of all in Paramāṭmā.—Endless spiral progress or evolution of jīvas through larger and larger worlds.—The meaning of 'death' of body and soul in terms of each other.—Continuous passing and repassing into and from each other, of egos and atoms.—Sūṭrāṭmā as means of such.—The connexion between the various subtler and coarser bodies of the jīva.—The principle of synthesis and antithesis, co-ordination and dis-ordination between various planes and worlds.—The practical utility of understanding these matters.—Right action follows only and surely on right knowledge.—Right knowledge followed by right action constitutes mokṣha.—Metaphysical views.

With reference to the opposition between Asmaṭ, I, and Yuṣhmaṭ, you, it should be noted that opposites are in the ultimate reality, one.[1]

---

[1] The actual truth of this is illustrated all around us in every day life. Youth and maid love

Everything includes its opposite, carries it within itself as a limb, an organ, a constituent part of its own total organism. What do we mean when we speak of an angry man? The

---

grow all in all to each other, marry—opposites become one; *and* have a large family—the one become many again. Then, the family, *born of the love*, now absorbs the care and time of each parent, in a different way, and they begin to be less than all in all to each other, gradually drift apart in interests, and may even suddenly find themselves disagreeing under the irritabilities produced by the too heavy strains of the family life. 'Like' had hidden within its womb the 'dislike' that now develops and manifests concealing within itself, in turn, again, as seed of future remorse, the 'like' out of which it grew forth —an endless rotation. A servant is treated kindly because he does his work and in order that he may be encouraged to do it better; the kindness, born of the good work, breeds sense of immunity, then carelessness, then impertinence and destroys the good work. A master is served well, because he is good and kind and in order that he may become more so; the assiduous service breeds in him habits of selfishness and luxury and destroys the kindness out of which the good service was born. Public honors are bestowed on a good public worker; they 'turn his head' and destroy the good work. Leaders, by excess of leading and commanding, alienate followers. Followers, by too much following, spoil their leaders. Armies, organised for purposes of offence

condition of anger is different from, is opposed and painful to, his normal condition, and yet is veritably included in his character, sva-bhāva, own-being, and is not separate and apart from

---

and defence, to add to the strength of a State, become a burden on its finances, and a source of weakness and danger. Genius, the overflowing strength of one faculty, over-reaches itself, becomes unbalanced insanity, and destroying what it fed upon, dies in poverty of starvation, or in the lunatic asylum of disease. Unique fashions of dress, ornaments, styles, intended to act as ideals, to set the fashion, degenerate into the common, the common-place, and the vulgar, by too much multiplication. Schemes of religious ministration and self-sacrificing help, by too much systematisation, lose their essential vital power of spontaneous feeling, and ossify and die in foul corruption, and imbecile formalities. Procreation, in some forms of life, leads to death. Nourishment, by overfeeding, to disease. Chemical components, combining, realising their characteristic affinities, in the very realisation lose their original character and undergo entire transformation. Joy carries the seed of sorrow within itself, and sorrow of joy. Excessive love becomes jealousy and then hate. Excessive hate, preserving its object for continual gratification, becomes love. Fire hides water within its constitution; and water fire; oxygen and hydrogen nourish fire and make water; and yet water and fire extinguish each other. The densest and most resistant solids carry the possibility of

the man. The reconciliation of separateness, and yet non-separateness, unity despite opposition, oneness simultaneously with manyness, is 'interdependence,' 'relativity,' sāpekshiṭaṭva.

---

becoming the most tenuous of gases; and *vice versa*. Everything, growing and multiplying, grows necessarily, inevitably, to excess, and so destroys itself. Even more immediately, anabolism is inseparable from katabolism, vital functioning means waste of tissue, living includes dying and dying includes living. Judged superficially, it will seem that this transformation from one into another and opposite is due to external circumstances. But looked at closely, it will be found that the word 'necessarily,' 'inevitably,' is the explanation of why these external circumstances themselves are present at all. The why, again, of this necessity is to be found in the nature of the absolute Consciousness, I-This-Not, which makes action and reaction necessary in the limited. (See *The Science of Peace*, ch. x. and xi.)

At first sight, the modern Hegel's statement, that Being is Nothing, might seem to be the same as the Ṛshi's, that opposites are one. The illustrations given above could perhaps be drawn from Hegel's statement also. But there is a slight difference—which makes all the difference between conviction and doubt. As Stirling, one of Hegel's profoundest exponents, himself confesses, this first statement of Hegel's, which is the foundation of the whole of his system, remains perplexing, doubtful, un-

In this fact may be found the true origin and significance of rāga and ḍveṣha, Love and Hate. Because the Self is, and is felt, everywhere, and everywhere knows and realises its

---

convincing. And yet it is also true that the bulk of the system is deeply thoughtful and true, and in agreement with the conclusions of the *Veḍānṭa* and those set forward here. What is the explanation? If the foundation is wrongly laid, the rest of the building ought to be awry? The explanation seems to be that Hegel *felt* the truth, but did not see it yet quite clearly—natural in the circumstances, it being exceedingly wonderful that he even saw as he did—and therefore could not express it clearly. Hegel says "Being is Nothing;" and that, being the same, they yet pass into one another and make becoming; in other words, in terms of consciousness, "I is Not-I," and the two passing into each other make the World-process. When Hegel's statement is thus made significant and brought home to ourselves by translation into terms of consciousness, we at once see the difficulty, the error or 'slip of the pen,' if we may so call it, into which Hegel seems to have fallen. Instead of saying "Being is Nothing" he should have said "Being is *Not*-Nothing," *i.e.*, "I is not Not-I". Then, later on, by mutual aḍhyāsa (see *The Science of Peace*, ch. xiii., it would have been possible for him to say "Partial being is partial nothing;" which would be a description of becoming; as Fichte better put it, ego in part=non-ego and *vice versa*.

unbroken unity and thread-continuity, therefore is there Love between all, by all, for all, in all places. So too, on the other hand, because the e ṭ a ṭ s, 'this's,' not-selves, the sheaths in which the Self manifests, are many and separate, therefore is there hate between them all. All this is matter of Necessity. With whom we have no necessity (to associate), no needs and interests bound up, with him there is no possibility of hate; or of love either; the two go together.

In a general sense, however, because all are

When Gārgyāyaṇa says "Opposites are one," he *seems* to say the same thing almost as Hegel—but what he means, as is obvious from all the work, is that "Opposites *taken together*, are one," make one, inhere in one. Of course in a certain sense Pure Being is the same as Pure Nothing; but then, such a 'same' cannot pass into or out of the 'same' to make something else, *i.e.*, Becoming. On the 'view' propounded by Gārgyāyaṇa, the explanation of the Universe is that when the totality of *the pairs of opposites* that make up the World-process is summed up, the result is a Nothing in which all the opposites have mutually abolished each other; and this nothing is negated, within Itself, by the Self which is Being; and, finally, as the net result of this negation we arrive at the Absolute, 'I—Not-I—Not,' where in all specific consciousness of all individual I's and particular Not-I's is merged and lost.

connected with and have necessity and need for all, therefore r ā g a, love, exists everywhere, *i.e.*, in the mind of every j ī v a and for everything whatever. We want to see things of which we have no particular need at all. We are curious to know about all things whatsoever. We walk along the road and look inquisitively at the things of the wayside. We wish to hear and overhear all kinds of talk (when not in real life, then in tales, at least). All this is the result of r ā g a.

The Self is everywhere and includes everything. I am the Self and wish to encompass everything too; I like everything; I like to own everything.

So, on the other hand, we experience ḍ v e ṣ h a, hate, dislike, aversion, without necessity, *i.e.*, with or by an opposite necessity; without any patent particular necessity, but because of the necessity of asserting the separate existence of the sheath we inhabit. 'I am so and so, but this fellow is not.' 'I am great, but this creature is contemptible.' 'I cannot associate with that low fellow.' 'Why *did* he talk thus of his betters?' etc.—such are only the grosser forms of that necessity of separate u p ā ḍ h i s, sheaths, without which individualised existence, however subtle and glorious, were impossible.

Where we have particular and obvious needs

and necessities, there special loves and hates, likes and dislikes, friendships and feuds, necessarily arise. He that helps to satisfy our needs is our friend. He that prevents their fulfilment, our enemy. He that balances both is impartial and equal or equable or indifferent. And so on.

We thus have two kinds of love and hate. One is of the nature of cause; the other is of the nature of effect. The former bases on the latent general all-pervading dual-necessity; the latter, on the patent special necessities of daily individual life.

The result of this interplay, the reconciliation of this opposition, of unity and manyness, love and hate, is a v a y a v-ā v a y a v ī-b h ā v a, 'the condition of organs and organism, parts and whole, attributes and substratum,' organisation of 'many' parts into higher and higher 'wholes' or 'ones' or individuals. And it is the duty of the student to bring home to himself, in terms of self, s v a m, and of love, this fact that the whole of the World-process is so *organised* in the P a r a m ā ṭ m ā, which is himself—a h a m e v-ā s m i s a r v a m, 'I myself am (or is) all.'

To return to particular loves and hates. These correspond with our knowledge. As our knowledge is, so is our action. It is true that we sometimes seem to act against our convictions; but the fact is in such cases that the convictions

are not deep enough, are not truly *real*-ised. As the expansion of knowledge is endless, such too is the expansion of activity. Never can activity, motion, cease, as all the sciences agree.

'Many' atoms are summed up in an individual brahmāṇḍa. 'Many' brahmāṇdas make up the oneness of a jagaṭ. 'Many' jagaṭs are subsumed in the individuality of a vishva. When a jīva has exhausted all the experiences and gained all the knowledge possible in and from his one brahmāṇḍa he goes on to the next higher and larger, and so on endlessly, on all possible scales, even beyond the samsāra of Mahāviṣhṇu. It goes out of one atom and into another; and atoms change their condition (avasṭhā) from time to time, also, on all scales, moment to moment and muhūrṭa to muhūrṭa and mahā-manvanṭara to mahā-manvanṭara and so on, in incessant growth and diminution, vṛḍḍhi and saṅkṣhaya, expansion and decay, and gradually become Brahmā, Viṣhṇu, Shiva, Mahāviṣhṇu, and greater than these, endlessly.

By opposition to the Unity of the Self appears the many This. And, again, by juxtaposition with the many This, the Self appears as many selves or jīvas. And jīvas and upāḍhis are inseparable. Yet there

must be incessant change also, and on all scales. Therefore jīvas are always passing from upāḍhi to upāḍhi, atom to atom, the atom vacated by one being instantly occupied by another (all this being possible because, being indeed only the translation in terms of time and space and limitation, of the one constant fact that all atoms and all jīvas exist in eternal conjunction in the Absolute Consciousness).

For familiar illustration, witness the new-born babe and its gradual growth in body and in mind (and then decay and death and passing into another body).

The destruction or dissolution of atoms also takes place. But they are generally spoken of as indestructible on the general ground that nothing is really ultimately destructible. For practical purposes, according to the *Veḍas*, the slowing down or the intensification of the vibration (manḍaṭā or ākrashtaṭā), for or by the storing of energy, shakṭi, (and *vice versâ?*) makes the beginning and the end (? the end and the beginning), the destruction and the birth (in their case).[1] Although atoms are mūla-prākṛṭika,

[1] See *The Secret Doctrine*, i, 545. This portion is very difficult to translate, for lack of continuity of traditional learning on the subject of atoms, in

(*i. e.*, belong to that the characteristic of which is concreteness, particularity) yet there is no possibility of an increase (of numbers? amongst them). Because they are endless (pseudo-infinite) once for all, by correspondence with the Infinite Self which they oppose everywhere and always. In fact this itself is Mūla-prakṛṭi. Hence aham and atom are interdependent. In every aham an atom, in every atom an aham. For this reason also is it said that all aṇus atoms, are similar, are equal (ultimately).

When an element of aham, ego, pursuing its due course of activity, passes from one piece of eṭaṭ, 'this,' to another, the former eṭaṭ is said to die, to become non-existent, to perish, *i. e.*, to merge and disappear into deeper existence. This former eṭaṭ then goes back into its original element, ākāsha, etc., and staying

---

Samskṛṭ. The literal translation of the text would perhaps be: "For the sake of providing energy, or storing up energy, by the succession of slowness and intensification, the beginning and end—this only is destruction and origin, as is declared by the *Veḍas.*" Whatever alteration or addition of idea may appear in the *paraphrase* above as compared with this, may perhaps be seen to be justifiable on reading later statements in the text.

there, matures its work;[1] and then again develops activity in association with another element of a h a m. The j ī v a also, on the other hand, for the maturation of its work and faculty, takes another suitable atom[2] to

---

[1] 'Its original element' apparently means the large masses of it which form the sheath of the corresponding cosmic ḍ e v a, and are ensouled by his a h a m, a personality, the same in kind, but very different in degree of 'separativeness'. This would be needed to fulfil the law that spirit and matter, a h a m and e ṭ a ṭ can never be apart, that there is nowhere any such thing as inanimate matter. 'Matures its work' seems to mean that it digests and assimilates the experiences of vibrating in response to the more acutely personal consciousness which it underwent when attached to a more 'personal' j ī v a, that it further ripens and perfects its capacity for being the means and instrument for that kind of activity of a h a m-life which it subserved formerly.

[2] The word atom here should be understood in a comparative sense, as meaning rather the whole astral sheath or egg; so, the physical e ṭ a ṭ which is dropped is also not the permanent physical atom, but the body as a whole. That the general statement of the text is correct however, with regard even to atoms, we may gather from the fact that the Ḍharma-kāya Buḍḍha, the v i ḍ e h a-m u k ṭ a, drops even the permanent physical atom.

itself and dwells in Kāmaloka, etc., for a time, and then spreads out its work again (on the physical plane). Such is the close and inseparable connexion between 'pieces' of a h a m and pieces of e ṭ a ṭ. There is no atom, no super-atom, no this, no that, without an ensouling element of a h a m. So neither can any element or feel of a h a m anywhere be specified, described, spoken of,

---

But yet again, the severance of connexion can never be quite complete—for the whole World-process is one unbreakable continuum. (See *The Science of Peace*, pp. 124, 129, 186, etc.)

Moreover, size is nothing. The original 'hole in space,' or bubble in the æther of space, in our—or any—universe, made by the breath of the Īshvara of the universe, is an a h a m; definite numbers of these, definitely arranged, form the 'atom' of each plane, and this again is an a h a m; these 'atoms,' in turn, form molecules, and molecules tissues, and tissues bodies, and each successive aggregation is similar in principle though not in bulk, so that there is no essential difference in meaning whether the word 'atom' or the word 'body' is used in this connexion. From the standpoint of the e ṭ a ṭ, bulk and interrelation and number are important differences; from the standpoint of the a h a m it is all one, himself and 'this'. [A. B.]

indicated in any way, without a piece of eṭaṭ. All conventions, all the behavior of individualised life, all recognition and use of time and space, depends upon a combination of these two.

In the name jīvāṭmā, the element of eṭaṭ, *i.e.*, the aṇu or atom is the jīva, and the element of aham is the āṭmā. It is true that when the two are separated, the former is called aṇu, atom, and the latter jīva;[1] but this is a matter of usage. As a

[1] For the 'metaphysic' of this see *The Science of Peace* ch. xv., p. 291. Of any and every 'pair,' in the domain of the Limited, one will masquerade as spirit, as subtler inner core, and the other as matter, as denser outer crust or body; and there will also appear a third, between, as nexus. In Theosophical phrase, in the 'metaphysical' or 'universal' interpretation, as *principles*, Āṭmā is the Universal I, Manas, the individual 'atom,' chiṭṭa-aṇu, inspired by the I which is individualised thereby; Buḍḍhi is the nexus between. This should hold good of all planes, and all worlds and all systems. But in 'physical' or 'particular' and empirical' interpretation, for 'practical' purposes, '**Āṭmā**' corresponds to, has its location or centre in, appears as a film of, āṭmic-plane matter, or **ākāsha**; Manas as a sheath of mental-plane matter, agni-ṭaṭṭva; and Buḍḍhi

fact, in view of the sūṭrāṭmā, because the element of eṭaṭ is bound up in that 'thread,' therefore, reciprocally, the element of continuity, the 'thread-I' always pervades it, *i.e.*, the atom. And, *vice versa*, the (pseudo-) thread-eṭaṭ permeates the element of aham.[1]

---

comes between, as vāyu or buḍḍhic-plane matter. Coming lower down, it would probably be correct to say that, from the Theosophical standpoint, for the vegetable kingdom, our mental plane-matter would stand for Áṭmā, our astral for Buḍḍhi, our physical for Manas. So, again, lower down, and so higher above; thus the āḍi, anupāḍaka and so-called āṭmic planes would make a triplet of Āṭmā, Buḍḍhi and Manas.

It may be noted that in the Yoga system the aham always includes all the sheaths in which the man is not self-conscious, *i.e.*, has not separated himself from the body in which he is working. At a low stage of evolution the aham is everything above the physical; later, everything above the astral, and so on step by step. Parts cannot be perceived in the 'invisible,' so the whole is conceived as a unit, a one. [A. B.]

[1] The notable inference from the text here ought not to be overlooked, *viz.*, that the jīva passes and can pass from one eṭaṭ to another, only along the lines of the sūṭrāṭmā in which it and both the eṭaṭs concerned are

The above is the aspect of samaṣhṭi, totality, the whole. In the partial or successive, one work or activity only being prominent at one time, there arises the appearance of a contradiction of the unity of the thread, of successive conjunction and disjunction. These two appearances occur in every atom, every moment.

Even in a single body, where unity is so prominent, we constantly see disruption thereof. During sleep the jīva 'contradicts' its unity with the sṭhūla or physical body, and works in the liṅga-body. Again 'opposing,' denying, its unity with the latter and disjoining itself therefrom, it works in the sūkṣhma. And disuniting with that, it goes into the kāraṇa. From that it goes still higher or deeper or subtler. Yet because the Āṭmā and

included. Continuity as well as discreteness is needed for every world-activity, in eternal paradox; and this is secured by the device of the sūṭrāṭmā, which means not only a single straight thread, but also that thread worked up into many knots and meshes and network. It means 'thread-soul' as well as group-soul and over-soul, 'web of life,' 'reticulated net-work,' 'nervous system,' and 'prāṇic web,' and 'buḍḍhi,' etc., etc., various things in various contexts and situations, from various points of view, as mentioned in previous footnotes.

the bodies are all threaded together, there never is a complete break. Even after reaching the kāraṇa, sūkṣhma, etc., when it 'wakes,' it begins to do all the work of the sṭhūla again, *because* it has all along remained 'near' to, retained touch with, the physical body too.

In this sense has it been said that all atoms go everywhere, that all brahmāṇdas, all samsāras, are literally connected together, differing only in grades of size, as larger and smaller.

And herein we discern the principles of sāmān-āḍhikaraṇya and vai-yaḍhi-karaṇya, co-ordination and disordination, synthesis and antithesis, parity and disparity, coherence and incoherence, relevance and irrelevance. That which is next to or continuous with another, not hidden or interrupted and suppressed by it, is co-ordinate with it. That which is screened off, superseded, opposed and abolished by another, is disordinate or disparate with it.[1]

---

[1] In other words, when two things can be seen simultaneously as in continuation of each other, as helping and supporting and forming part of each other, then they are coherent; when it is necessary to turn away from one in order to see the other when they negate each other, cannot be fitted in with each other, to their mutual support, then they are irreconcilable, separate, disparate.

To the deeper view, there is always synthesis, higher and higher, between all atoms, all worlds, all jīvas, in the endless unity and continuity of the thread of the Being of the Self. From the standpoint of the particular, on the other hand, there is always the appearance of disunion, discreteness, disorder, breach of law within law, and so on. For the practical purposes of life it is necessary to know such 'mediacies' and 'immediacies;' 'limits' and 'continuations;' 'antitheses' and 'syntheses;' to know that this (thing, cycle or system) begins and ends within these limits and also again is part and a continuation of this other (thing, cycle, etc.); to know that this fact is, in one view, incongruous with this other, and that, from another view, it is perfectly congruous with it, by the means of a larger and more wide-reaching fact. The repeated statement that atoms are included in worlds and worlds again in each of these atoms should be re-considered in the light of this principle of synthesis and antithesis.[1] It will appear then,

[1] See Fournier's *Two New Worlds*. That book, and what we can see around us with our physical eyes, leaves behind the impression that there are only two kinds of 'concretions,' 'formations' of matter, 'bodies,' *viz.*, globes and spheres or the heavenly bodies, and atoms and electrons, etc.,

how they are all graded together in reality, though appearing, to the cursory view, to be entirely independent, and even inconsistent with each other.

This principle too explains how all have need

---

moving, self-supported, freely in space, on the one hand, and "creatures" of many more or less irregular forms, men, animals, trees, living on those globes or spheres or atoms, on the other. From the metaphysical standpoint too, it is true that the spherical form is the most 'complete,' 'all-inclusive,' 'the same from all points of view' and is the nearest imitation in form of the Formless, and therefore most fitted to act as substratum and support of all other forms, while itself self-supporting—thus further imitating the attributes of the Attributeless. But there does not seem to be, from that standpoint, any sufficient reason for the *universal* reign of any *particular* ratios and proportions, such as are mentioned in the book. They may well hold good of a particular world-system. But probably in different worlds, 'infra' and 'supra,' different ratios between 'atoms' and 'creatures' and 'globes' etc., prevail. Metaphysic requires that there should be all possible shapes and all possible sizes of beings, in all parts of space, on all possible planes, etc., emerging out of and merging back into the spherical, for otherwise there would be arbitrariness, lack of sufficient reason, which lack is intolerable to metaphysic.

of all, everywhere, always; and what the further and fuller significance and justification is, of interdependence and independence, prayer and self-sufficiency, veneration and opposition, friendship and enmity, possibility and impossibility, association, desire for company, desire for solitude, compassion, ambition, competition, charity, ḍharma or duty, japa or meditation by repetition and recitation of sounds and meanings, yajña or sacrifice, etc.

Out of such understanding of the essential significance of world-facts, out of such knowledge of Truth, Self, Brahman, arises mokṣha. To know the truth and to regulate conduct in accordance therewith—this is the fruit of true knowledge, and this is mokṣha. Hence the saying, mukṭi results from ṭaṭṭva-jñāna. Out of that knowledge arises the conviction that pleasure and pain, joy and sorrow, are nothing real, are only passing phases and appearances in the jīva and belong not to the inner Self; that all are really one and all abide everlastingly in the peace of Saṭ-chiḍ-ānanḍa. All sciences too but endeavor, ultimately, to indicate this Unity as underlying the diversity of the objects they deal with specially and respectively.

Because of the essential connexion between knowledge and action do we find the advice

given everywhere, in every language, "Think before you act," "Study the subject and acquire all available information about it, before beginning practical operations". Even Mahāvishṇu, as said before, completes his *ideation*, embodied in the *Veḍas*, before beginning the work of creation. In further illustration of the same principle of succession, we have again, within each treatise too, at first only a leading up or introduction to, an indication of, the nature of the subject-matter, and then follows a description of the processes whereby it may be secured.

Therefore, everywhere, in every department of life, ought we to have right knowledge first, and then it should be and will be followed by right action. Perfect knowledge followed by perfect action constitutes m o k ṣ h a. And perfect knowledge consists in realising the Infinite Unity in endless Diversity: All is within all, transcendence beyond transcendence, endlessness after endlessness, beginninglessness before beginninglessness, beginnings and ends behind beginnings and ends, succession above succession, synthesis over synthesis, Infinity around Infinity.

CHAPTER XXI.

THE MAIN PSYCHOLOGICAL FEATURES OF THE JĪVĀṬMĀ.

The reason why the Logion in terms of sound is so important for us.—The derivation therefrom of the three main constituents of the jivâṭmâ.—Cognition, desire and action.—The world-facts derived from these.—The order of succession of the three.—Their dual form, causal and effectual.—Special considerations as to desire.—Dual form of work, particular and universal.—Metaphysical negations.

It has been repeatedly declared before that the Logion is Brahma-Vākya, 'the utterance of Brahman by Brahmā,' and includes and expresses everything. The reason why this expression of Brahman in terms of sound is so prominent with us is that in our world-system and at the present time, ākāsha is super-important and all-pervading, and the quality of ākāsha is sound. Otherwise, there are mahaṭ and buḍḍhi[1] (in our own world-system) besides the recognised five elements, and subtler atoms and super-atoms endlessly.

[1] The suggestion seems to be that these two in our own world-system and endless others in other

Out of the three words (*i.e.*, the facts indicated by the words) of the Logion, now, we should see the derivation of cognition, desire and action.

The pratyābhāsa, reflexion, mirroring, counter-appearance, picturing or imaging of the Aham in the Eṭaṭ is cognition. The reflexion of the Eṭaṭ in the Aham is kriyā.[1]

---

systems, have special *sensuous* qualities also, (just as ākāsha has sound, vāyu touch, agni visibility, and so on), though with us, and just at this stage, they are serving as substrata or vehicles for certain 'inner' or 'subjective processes principally.

[1] Compare pp. 242 and 265, etc., of *The Science of Peace*. The descriptions there, of cognition and action, seem exactly to have changed places as compared with the descriptions here. On closer examination, it is possible to explain away the apparent difference (see p. 268 of *The Science of Peace*). One more or less current metaphysical view is that "I can know only my own self, perceive only my own conditions, modifications of consciousness, etc." There is an element of exaggeration with an element of truth in this. The exaggeration consists in the word 'only,' for what is the significance of the words '*my own* self' '*my own* conditions,' etc., *without* a reference to something *else than* my own; and if there is such a tacit reference to and distinction from 'else than my own' involved in the statement, does not the statement approxi-

The reflexion of the two, Aham and Eṭaṭ, in the Na is (dual) desire. Aham-Eṭaṭ-na-

---

mate in nature to that famous statement, of the Cretan who declared that all Cretans were liars? To put it from another point of view, the exaggeration consists in ascribing to the individual self what is true of the Universal Self. And this indicates the element of truth also in the statement. The Universal Self, indeed, can know nothing else than modifications of Itself, for there is 'Nothing Else,' 'No Not-I'. And each individual self knows and can know only in and by means of the knowledge of the Universal Self. The 'working out' of this metaphysical necessity in the details of the Limited, is one of the reasons for the existence of endless suṭrāṭmās, individuals within and over individuals; also the existence of sense-media, ākāsha, vāyu, etc., in modern terms, air, light saliva, particles, etc.); also the existence of aḍhiṣhṭhāṭṛ-ḍevas, 'gods,' with peculiar plastic and elastic forms and degrees of the feeling of 'personality,' ruling the inḍriyas and the masses of sensuous-elements which make up their bodies and so on. In still more minute detail, the working out of the necessity results in the fact that, in the individual self, before anything can be cognised, it has to be reduced into the semblance of identity with the perceiving self, to become a state, a mood, a modification of it or its consciousness; thus the visual object must become a pictured shaping of the retinal purpurine

a s m i, I-this-not-am, makes up the s a m ā h a r a, summation, by the use of the verb a s, 'to be'.

---

which is part of the perceiving self; the aural object, a vibration of the tympanum; a gustatory object, an ensalivation of the papillæ of the tongue and so on. And this process is repeated in the subtler bodies as the centre of consciousness recedes inwards. Concrete thinking is shapings of mindstuff, mental matter. In this sense, it may well be said that the nature of the a h a m, its subjective quality, must be reflected in, be imposed on, the e ṭ a ṭ, in order that cognition may arise—and cognition of *another*, an *object*, and not only of 'my own states'.

So, on the other hand, it may well be said that the definite picturing of the eṭaṭ in one's own mind, that is to say, of the objective state of things that is desired to be produced, before beginning to realise it in matter, is the subjective aspect of k r i y ā, is the reflexion of the e ṭ a ṭ in the I.

This may suggest one way of 'bridging the gulf between consciousness (in the sense of mind) and matter,' of retaining the two as distinct and yet reducing them into terms of each other; in other words, in accordance with the nature of the Logion, all experience, and therefore all thinking also, is but one or the other of two and only two ways of selffeeling, *viz.*, either 'I *am* this' or 'I *am not* this'; no living being looks at any the most inanimate object except in terms of 'mine and thine', *i.e.*, as *part* of some self or other; there is nowhere

In other words, I-this is cognition, and This-I is action. I ṭ ṭ h a m and e v a m, 'such' and 'thus,' have place here. There is no conjunction with another so long as there are no 'such' and 'thus'. 'I' can enter into another only by some p r a k ā r a, *method*. Without a method, entry is impossible. And the method is 'such' or 'thus'. For this reason, then, *viz.*, that k r i y ā is a matter of y o g a, conjunction, and conjunction is possible only by a means, a device, is it said that the reflexion of E ṭ a ṭ in A h a m is (the device ? which produces) k r i y ā.

The appearance of the union of A h a m and E ṭ a ṭ is (their mutual) negation, and that is

---

a pure *opposition* only of subject and object; mind and matter are never *separate*, but only distinguishable. Of course, the real and final bridging is done only when the Logion 'negates' matter as such and makes it a mere 'supposition' of Consciousness something whose very substance is 'imagination' or thought.

Matter is really non-existent from the standpoint of observation. It consists merely of holes in æther (see *Occult Chemistry*, Appendix on 'Æther of Space'), maintained by the will of the Logos, and if He withdraws this will, matter vanishes, every form of it being ultimately reducible to these holes. Modern science is beginning to reach after this idea, sometimes speaking of matter as 'spaces,' sometimes as 'strains'. [A. B.]

desire.[1] The Scripture says: Whatever is like, similar or equal to another, that desires that other.[2] 'May I be synthesised, co-ordinated, related, united with that other.'

The permutations and combinations of these three, cognition, desire and action, take place in Accordance with (*i.e.*, in terms of) time, space and substance.[3]

---

[1] It is obvious that desire is that which 'brings together' and unites subject and object, more or less changing or 'negating' the original character of each, which, among other reasons, is why it is characterised as 'negation.'

[2] Compare the English expressions 'I *like* this' and 'I do not like, or I dislike this' and 'This is not like him to do so or so;' and the current Samskṛṭ saying, समानशीलव्यसनेषु सख्यम्, 'Friendships arise between persons of like tastes and temperaments.' This is exactly the 'paradoxical' nature of Desire. It is affirmative as well as negative. I 'like' what is more or less 'like' me, is to my taste; yet at the same time I 'want,' is proof that I am 'not' content with exactly what I am; I 'want' to be something *else*, something more than, I am; and when I am that else, then I shall 'negate' that also and want something else again, endlessly.

[3] The *Praṇava-Vāḍa* nowhere definitely assigns the triplet of time, space and motion, to the negation in the same way as it does s a ṭ-c h i ḍ-

The changes of time give rise to day and night, waking and sleep, birth and death, creation and dissolution, and all the endless world-cycles, yugas, kalpas, etc. In space we have, 'this is here and thus,' 'this is not here, thus,' etc., plena and vacua, systems and empty spaces, objects of consciousness and lacunæ. In kriyā, motion, we have 'this is born out of that, thus,' or 'not thus,' or 'not out of this,' 'this is possible,' etc., *i.e.*, causes and effects, patence and latence, (of things and thoughts).[1] Numbers arise also out of succession, two, three, etc., to pseudo-infinity.

ānanḍa to Praṭyagāṭmā and saṭṭva-rajas-ṭamas to Mūla-prakṛṭi. No characteristic triplet of qualities or attributes is assigned to Shakṭi or Ḍaivī-prakṛṭi either, like creation, preservation and destruction; only jñāna, ichchhā and kriyā are spoken of as three shakṭis. But such triplets may well be inferred. Chap. xviii. above speaks of the energies of integration, disintegration and manifestation.

[1] Just before, the triplet mentioned is time, place and *substance*, vasṭu. In the detail, here, substance is replaced by kriyā, action or motion, which goes more naturally and normally with time and space. The intention of such ringing of changes is to induce the reader to discover for himself correspondences and changes of aspects from different standpoints. 'Substance' corresponds

Out of these facts arise such pairs as 'actor and inspirer,' 'employer and employed;' and the facts are universal and common to all time. If activity were minutely recorded from the very beginning of the vinihiṭa-cycle and down to the present moment, even then nothing new in principle or radically different from these processes that we observe around us to-day would be discovered. But, of course, the concrete detail differs with each individual and each act of each individual, so that each cognition and each action may be said to be unique, in one sense.

Further, out of these same facts arise necessarily the periodic growth and decay, contraction and expansion, of everything in the World-process, with an intervening appearance of stability, permanence, unchangingness, that reflects or imitates the state of Brahman. And this periodicity extends endlessly in time and ranges over all possible scales. For the All never begins at *one* time; nor ever ends at *one* time. Only limited beginnings, beginnings of limited things and worlds, take place at particular times, in particular places, and

---

to M, in the triplet of substance-quality-action; but in the triplet of space-time-motion, motion corresponds to M, all three being sub-divisions and attributes of the higher M.

are matched by similarly limited endings. Whatever has a beginning must necessarily have an end also.

In this wise may the essential nature and bearings of k r i y ā be ascertained.

But as to desire, because it is the foundation of all and inheres in all, and is of the nature of negation, because it involves reciprocity, mutual dependence (and circular definitions), therefore is it hinted or even declared expressly that it is not fit object for *knowledge* (in a sense; for in that sense it is 'unreason,' the opposite of reason; the impelling force that throws out of balance, out of equilibrium, whereas reason restores just proportion and equilibrium; but of course desire is as much object or part and aspect of consciousness as knowledge and activity). It is true that desire is stated to arise from knowledge, but that statement has reference to the *effect*-form of desire. In its *causal* form, it is behind (particular) knowledge (of the nature of *effect*), for without (the vague, general, desire to know, there can be no knowledge, as is made clear in the *Ākara*.[1] Nor is desire the object of itself, *i.e.*, of desire,

[1] Said by Paṇḍiṭ Ḍhanarāja to be the name of a *Bhāṣhya* or commentary by Bārhāyaṇa on the real *Brahma-Sūṭras* (ten thousand in number, the current being only five hundred and fifty-five).

To the argument itself, it may be replied, in

any more than it is of knowledge. (We do not desire desires). When we say we know desires, we only mean we *feel* desires, are aware of desiring, in the same sense in which we are aware of knowing and of acting. Such awareness is pure consciousness, or self-consciousness, which includes all three aspects and cannot be particularly identified with any one only.

Work is dual, (1) partial, (personal), relating to a part, and (2) general, (impersonal), relating to *the* Whole, or *a* whole. By practice of the former, in course of time, the nature of and the capacity for the performance of the latter is learnt and acquired. And this is the proper fruit of the knowledge of Brahman.

But in reality,
I am not either space, or time, or motion,
Nor here, nor there, nor home, nor lands unknown,

---

coin, that there cannot be any even general and vague desire to know without some pre-involved vague and general knowledge of 'something' to be desired; in other words that a particular desire to know, means only and always a desire to know more or better than before. But all this is discussed more fully elsewhere, in the work, and the final truth is that in the 'causal' form, from the transcendental point of view, all three are simultaneous, and in the effect-form, as particular experiences, they rotate endlessly.

Nor known of script, nor missed of ignorance,
Nor co-existence, nor successiveness,
Nor action, nor cognition, nor desire,
Nor both nor all at once, nor one by one,
But am I ever One, and One Alone.

CHAPTER XXII.

FURTHER CONSIDERATIONS AS TO KRIYĀ.

The supreme importance of kriyā.—Philological considerations and illustrations.—Opposite doctrines; (*a*) all words are derivative and of gradual growth and evolution; (*b*) all are radical and fortuitous.—Reconciliation by difference of standpoint.—Triplets involved by kriyā.—Space-time-motion as objective conditions of it.—Definitions of space, of time, and of energy (in place of motion).—Their relations, as *locus standi*, one to another.—The subjective conditions of kriyā.—Karṭā or actor.—Kārya, act or work.—Kāraṇa (or karaṇa?), cause or instrumental cause, instrument.—Prayojana, 'engaging' motive.—Explanation of free-will or self-dependence.—Metaphysical considerations of the interdependence of all.—Correspondences.

The supreme importance of kriyā, work, action, is manifest from the fact that the whole of the World-process is one constant activity. Even the correct use of language is not possible without action (*i.e.*, without the action of speaking, obviously; and also, without the employment of words denoting activity). It may be said that sense may be conveyed also by the exclusive use of subanṭas, nouns variously

inflected with prepositional terminations. But in reality such nouns always imply and depend upon ṭiṅganṭas, verbs variously inflected.[1] (For when it is said that subanṭas suffice by themselves to convey sense, what is really done is that) kṛḍanṭas, various participles (which, for purposes of case-endings behave exactly like the other subanṭas) are included amongst the subanṭas and regarded as one with them; and so only, *i.e.*, by using kṛḍanṭas with subanṭas, can any sense be intellegibly conveyed. And it is obvious that in reality kṛḍanṭas are the same as ṭiṅganṭas. In the (apparently verbless Samskṛṭ) sentence, 'This, here, by me done; not done by thee,' composed of 'nouns' only,

[1] All these considerations of grammar may at first sight perhaps appear inappropriate to the modern reader accustomed to meet with grammar and psychology in separate text-books only. But he should remember that the *Praṇava-Vāḍa* purports to be an encyclopædia of the underlying principles of *all* the sciences, showing the interrelation between them; and further that thought and language are particularly interdependent at the present stage of evolution, sound and ākāsha being earlier manifestations than the others. Not only in Samskṛṭ, but even in other languages also, though perhaps to a lesser extent, philology throws light on psychology in a most valuable manner.

although the word 'done' appears to be a participial adjective to 'work,' yet in reality it amounts to the verb-expression, 'has been done'. If this same analysis is pursued further it will appear that even as kṛḍanṭas, participial adjectives, behaving as the nouns with which they are in apposition, have their manifest foundation in verb-roots, even so these nouns proper of to-day ultimately derive their origin in the past from roots denoting activity

The vyuṭpanna-pakṣha, 'derivation-doctrine' in grammar is expressly this that all nouns are derived and evolved out of verbs, by the successive addition of various affixes and prefixes, etc., to the latter. On the other side is the a-vyuṭpanna-pakṣha, 'non-derivation-doctrine'. This doctrine holds that all words, names, namings, are underived, radical, fortuitous, arbitrary, like Brahman itself; that they are independent of all considerations of time, space, and affinity with others; that they have no analysable characteristics, and are each and all pre-destined, like all the other items of all Becoming, all the World-process; that no real explanation of them is possible; and that each speaker uses them according as their meanings appear to him under the stress of his necessity so that the same word-sound means one thing in one

language and entirely another in another.

The reconciliation between these views is that in one sense all words are derivative; and in another, all radical. The words that express disruption of the unity of the I, refer to activity, and are all derived from verb-roots denoting action; this is the view from the standpoint of v y a ṣ h t i, the part, the particular, the individual. On the other hand, the words that are concerned with the universal unity of the I, they are non-derivative, radical; this is the standpoint of the s ā r v i k a, universal. And, finally, each and every word is both of these, in turn, from different standpoints; each is derivative and each radical.[1]

---

[1] This may perhaps be expressed in other words thus: We may be able to trace the existing words of any language further and further back to roots behind roots; but wherever we come to a stop, there, we must admit, at least for the time being and till we can burrow further, that the connexion between that last-found root and its meaning is fortuitous. Onomatopœia will not help beyond certain limits. That the serpent moving through grass should make the sound 'sarp, sarp' or 'srip, srip' is itself fortuitous, accidental, arbitrary. We may develop our science of acoustics and of the physiology of the auditory apparatus, and, going a step further, understand how that particular shaking of grass appears as that particular sound to this

Hence has it been declared that all words are classifiable into nouns and verbs, the former corresponding to Āṭmā and the latter to Anāṭmā; and again that the 'derivative'

---

particular human ear; but if any one of these three factors varies, the result changes, and a deeper 'how' and 'why' are again to seek.

From different standpoints—variations of the two main ones, the transcendental and the empirical—because of the universal reign of the law of causality and progressive development of effects out of causes, we have the 'derivation-doctrine,' the theory of evolution in the kingdom of words; because of the ultimate fact that nothing can appear in effect which was not already in the cause, that all evolution is only a successive unfolding of a pre-existent simultaneous 'many' which includes at once all possible forms whatsoever, we have the 'radicality-doctrine,' eternally fixed species. All words and all things else are 'derived' from the Absolute Consciousness, within which they all eternally exist as 'arbitrary,' 'unique presentations,' each 'separate and different' from all others. (See *The Science of Peace*, p. 123.)

The particular psychological and metaphysical significance of the discussion and conclusion that nouns are derived from verbs, while verbs themselves may be regarded as radical, is that manifestation, manifested *existence*, is not possible without activity (See *The Science of Peace*, p. 240; also the pages on 'Grammar,' *supra*.)

words refer to kriyā, and the radical are sanāṭana, eternal.

The sṭhāna, *locus standi*, of activity is ḍesha, space. All action takes place in space and is impossible without it. The triplet here is ḍesha-kāla-kriyā, space-time-motion. That wherein and whereby is possible the many-ness of the This, the opposition to the unity of the I—that is Space. In other words, it is the avasṭhā, the *condition* of the negation or identity between I and This. It is true that when avas-ṭhā is spoken of, there is already an implication of some kind of action (sṭhā, to stand); yet the predominant reference is to the 'standing,' the continuance in one place of that action; and so avasṭhā comes invariably to imply space. The etymology runs thus: ava[1] is the Āṭmā which ought to be carefully 'guarded' on all sides and is in turn the 'protector' of all; and that wherein it 'stands' and manifests is sṭha. Thus the general condition of the possibility of the 'standing' of all particular conditions and states is Space. As the *Brahma-Sūṭra* says: The state of opposition to the Unity of the Self is the many, nānā; and the opposition to the identification of the many is Space (*i.e.*, the

---

[1] In modern Samskṛṭ Grammar, ava, as a prefix, means 'on all sides, all round;' and av, as a verb-root, means to protect.

necessary condition in which becomes possible that opposition; or that space is itself of the nature of opposition between the one and the many, which, by mutual abolition, make emptiness).

Again, the *Brahma-Sūṭra* says: The succession in and of the many is time, K ā l a.

Yet again: The necessity of the succession is S h a k ṭ i, Ability, Might, Energy.

These three aphorisms[1] define the essential nature of the triplet. The necessary 'becoming,' coming forth, manifesting (co-existently) of the many is ḍ e s h a, space. Whatever 'becomes' has phases or conditions; and we also want to enquire '*where* does it become, *i.e.*, manifest'. 'What happens; what or who causes it to, *i.e.*, why does it, happen; how does it happen, by what process or method'—all these are allied considerations. The very etymology and definition of the word ḍ e s h a shows the real nature of the fact indicated, that wherein a thing is

[1] Compare these with the fourteen aphorisms mentioned in the Preface, p. li. as framed by the translator, tentatively for his own use, long before he had heard of the *Praṇava-Vāḍa*—showing how all truths ever exist in the store of All-Knowledge, and how individuals see little pieces of them from time to time, even without continuous handing on from generation to generation in the flesh.

'shown forth,' ḍishyaṭe, 'created,' sṛjyaṭe, 'stands,' sṭhīyaṭe. Yet again, the appearance in yoga, combination, juxtaposition, of I and This is space. 'Here, there'—this is the form of space. It should be remembered that space can never be defined or indicated except in terms of kriyā.

On the other hand kriyā, motion, is connected equally with time. Space and time are not immediately but only indirectly connected with each other, through the medium of motion which is immediately related to both. The *locus standi* of time is motion; that of motion, space. Space, because it is the forum of both time and motion is sometimes described as the Self Itself.[1]

All action inevitably involves four inseparable factors, karṭā, kārya, kāraṇa and prayōjana, *i.e.*, actor, act, cause and motive.[2]

---

[1] Compare the *Paurāṇika* legend that Kâla-Ruḍra, (a form of Shiva, corresponding to desire, ṭamas or ichchhâ and time, kâla, which also means 'black') was born from Brahmâ (corresponding to kriyâ) and that Brahmâ was born from Vishṇu (corresponding to jnâna and Self.) Also the *Purāṇa* verse विष्णुरात्मवतां श्रेष्ठो दुर्विषह्यतमो भवः, "Vishṇu is the best of the Possessors of Self; Bhava or Ruḍra is the most irresistible."

[2] It is not easy to fix the correspondence exactly

These four correspond, as usual, to A, U, M and the total, or cognition, desire, action and the summation. Indeed the totality of these four is kriyā. The definition or description of kriyā is possible only by means of these four. The etymology of kriyā is manifold; so also is its significance.[1] (i) karaṇam, doing, acting, is kriyā, the act or action itself. Or (ii) kriyaṭe anena or anayā, that by or by means of which (a thing or act) is done, acted, made, is kriyā. This construction is connected with the idea of causal effort. Again (iii) karoṭi iṭi kriyā, 'does,' 'acts'—this itself is kriyā. Here the reference is to the actor the doer, the maker, karṭā. The manifestation of the kriyā (self-assertion or self-realisation by external expression), the final purpose of the other three, is the motive, prayōjana.

Karṭum yogyam, that which is fit,

---

between these and the expressions of western philosophy, 'efficient cause,' 'final cause,' 'material cause,' 'formal cause,' 'instrumental cause,' etc. Different 'seers,' by difference of personal constitution, and time, place and circumstance, see different aspects naturally. The descriptions that follow will enable the reader, who cares to study the subject more closely, to adjust the 'personal equations' and see what correspondences there are.

[1] The more technical grammatical expressions are omitted as impossible to translate.

proper, desirable, to do—that is k ā r y a m. Only that is 'fit to do' which 'is to become' (prearranged, premeditated, 'provided for' by providence, 'the will of God' etc.). And *all* 'becoming' is 'to become, to happen' (in the proper times and places); for all becoming is matter of necessity, and whatever is necessary is done. Thus k ā r y a m, the 'to be done,' 'work,' 'duty,' is included in k r i y ā, action. K ā r-y a m is also called k a r m a. That which is "the most desired to be obtained" by the actor —that is k a r m a. And the y o g y a, 'the fit or proper to unite with,' the 'joinable,' is 'the most desired'. Every actor enters upon work after duly considering to the best of his intelligence what is fit or not fit for him to do. Hence k ā r y a is k a r m a. The *Brahma-Sūṭra* says: The most desired is k a r m a.[1]

[1] All this may at first sight appear to be mere quibbling—but is not so. The importance attached to philology in ancient thought has been explained in a preceding footnote. Here, in terms of philology, it is explained why some j ī v a s perform action, which to others appear frivolous or harmful. As to "the most desired" being k a r m a,—this seems to be a somewhat colloquial way of saying that a person acts only in accordance with his deepest, most real, most actual desire and conviction. Strictly, the object of desire is substance, not action; all others are objects only indirectly.

That which immediately, without the help of a medium, accomplishes a k ā r y a—that is k ā r a ṇ a m. It is this immediacy which distinguishes the k ā r a ṇ a m, the cause, from the k a r ṭ ā, the doer. Otherwise, on the view that a piece of work is accomplished only by whosoever desires it most, the one would take the place of the other. As it is, the Science of Language declares: The immediate executor, beneficial to (*i.e.*, promotive of or favoring the existence or the accomplishment of,) the result in the highest degree, is the k ā r a ṇ a, while the k a r ṭ ā is more distant. As the Nayyayikas say: That which is immediately next before another—is its cause. Or the Mīmāṁsakas: The im-mediate is the chief cause. Or the Veḍānṭis: That which accomplishes or brings about in the highest degree, and is immediate—that is the cause. Or the Sāṅkhyas: The immediate one of the three is the cause. Or the Vaisheṣhikas: The origination or production of things without a medium, immediately—this is cause (or causing). Or the Yogīs: The a b h i-n i-y o j a n a, or disposition, assignment, allocation, arrangement, of all immediately (—this is causing). Because such is the only distinction between the two, therefore is only one case, the ṭ ṛ ṭ ī y ā, third or instrumental employed for both (doer

and cause, to indicate their relation to the effect)—'caused by' as well as 'done by'.[1]

The kartṭā is that which or he who appears, shines forth, manifests in kriyā as self-dependent. He who acts is inside the action, permeates and pervades it. He is said to be self-dependent, because without him kriyā cannot take place (while he himself is not bound to perform any particular kriyā). He initiates action and makes it possible. Ṭanṭra is aḍhikāra, office, function, authority, business, business-relation, reference; and one who functions only as authorised by himself, and is not put into relations with any one or anything by the will of any other—such a one is svāḍhikārī or sva-ṭanṭra.[2] Thus, then, the kāraka, the self-directed causer of action, nirapekṣhiṭa or independent, 'not looking to another,' is the name of the kartṭā. Of course it is true that all limited things or persons are mutually dependent; but because the

[1] It would seem that the word kāraṇa in this part of the text is used in the sense in which karaṇa, or instrument, or instrumental cause, is used now-a-days.

[2] A *Brahma-Sūṭra* aphorism defining ṭanṭra is quoted here and briefly expounded. The whole looks very promising in a psycho-philological reference, but is so very obscure and incomplete that I have not ventured on a translation.

sva, (the own), is declared to be the Āṭmā, the Self, therefore is it also said to be self-dependent. The sole creator, maker, actor, karṭā of This-world is Āṭmā, and It is in every way undisputedly Self-dependent. Following It, in imitation of It, all selves, small or large, everywhen, everywhere and always appear as self-dependent (*i.e.*, possessed of free-will) also.[1]

The prayojana, 'engaging motive,' that which induces a person to engage in or 'joins him to' work, yojayaṭi, or that which is joined, yujyaṭe, *i.e.*, that by or by means or because of which work is joined or engaged in by the worker, or which itself joins with or merges in the worker or the work or both, to bring the two together—that is the prayojana. It is the 'totality,' the summation of the three, *viz.*, worker, instrument and work. (From the transcendental or metaphysical standpoint) all is joined with and inseparably related to all; hence all is motive to all. Because of the union of I and This, I is the maker or creator of all; and because It is in touch with every piece of the Not-I, therefore all particulars may also be said to be in immediate contact with each

---

[1] See *the Science of Peace*, ch. xi. for discussion on free-will, and explanation of how the *Whole* is the cause of each part.

other; therefore all (and each) is the cause of all (and each). Yet, again, the effect is nothing else than the cause; and the cause nothing else than the effect. And the case is the same with actor and motive (for motive is ultimately desire, and desire is part of the being of the actor). On this principle, all is the kārya or effect of all, too. From the empirical or experiential standpoint of the limited and the particular, on the other hand, each appears as different and separate.

As stated in the *Nyāya*: Vyāharaṇa, the gathering together of all things, all padārṭhas, all objects whatsoever, in one (*i.e.*, seeing the whole of the World-process, inner and outer, within and without, subjective and objective, as one unbroken continuum of consciousness); and then the contemplation of the past, present and future of this continuum as all concentrated into one, (one point, one Now and one Here), all at once and all as one—this is the supreme kriyā.[1]

The actor is the Self; the work, the Not-Self; the instrumental cause, the Negation or Desire; the motive is the Summation.

---

[1] Compare *Yoga-Sūṭra*, iii. 51, on vivekaja-jñāna, which seems to answer to nothing more closely than the Logion, summing up all at once and also amounting to viveka-khyāṭi.

CHAPTER XXIII.

THE COMPANIONS OF KRIYĀ.

The metaphysical nature of action.—The meaning of action.—Its manifest result, the triplet of birth-stay-death.—The definition of each.—The quartette of factors involved in each of the three.—No fixity of anything, anywhere and ever.—The five main kinds of action.—Three principals.—Illustration from day and night.—Endless variations of ways of action and evolution.—Supremacy of Self over all, great and little, success and failure.—Action as the result of desire and necessity.—The growth of joys and sorrows, friendships and hostilities, out of such necessities, and consequent emotional investment of the acts of going and coming, birth and death, as well and ill.—The unity of all in gamana. —Further considerations as to prasāraṇa.—Its sub-divisions.—The sub-divisions of kuñchana.—Health and disease.—Avoidance of excess.—Metaphysical transcendence of all movements by the Self.

The nature of kriyā may be described thus: Because the Self is present everywhere, and because it is a matter of necessity that its unity should be opposed at all possible 'wheres,' all points, sarv-āmshe, in all parts, therefore

the Not-Self too reaches out to and endeavors to be present in every part and at every point (of space and time); the Self and the Not-Self show themselves in opposition (affirmation-negation, identification-separation) everywhere, ever, everyway—this is kriyā.[1] And yet again, it is not a mere showing or seeing of each other to or by each other; but a yoga, a union, or conjunction of the two (including a vi-yoga or disjunction). Karma takes place everywhere as subservient to or in pursuit of this yoga. The actor is the Self; Its 'desired,' 'beloved,' the object of Its desire is the Not-Self, and that is karma, work, action (which, in Samskṛṭ Grammar, means also the predicate, the word in the accusative case, the object of the activity, the karṭā being the subject in the nominative case). In the conjunction of karṭā and karma lies kriyā as the nexus between them.

The vyavasāya or purposeful effort throughout all kriyā is but this, *viz.*, that the self secures what it desires; and it always desires a 'this'. 'May this and this spread forth,' 'May

---

[1] In other words, the endeavor of every eṭaṭ to encompass the whole of Aham, in respect of all points of space and moments of time; and, *vice versâ*, of every individualised aham to encompass all eṭaṭs similarly—this is kriyā.

this be achieved,' 'May I be in this,' 'May this be in me,' 'May this be in this,' and so on. 'Not this,' 'Not this' is also always within its purview and intention. Thus, therefore, in the projection or working out of the idea, 'I-This-Not' we have the threefold kriyā of uṭpaṭṭi-sṭhiṭi-nāsha, birth-life-death, creation-preservation-destruction, origin-persistence-end, anabolism-metabolism-katabolism. 'Becoming' is origin; the appearance to each other of Aham and Eṭaṭ is origin, production, birth. 'This is thus,' 'this comes after this'—such is the nature of preservation, maintenance, continuance. The appearance of I and This as one, their mergence and disappearance into each other, is death or destruction. In other words, the taking away and placing elsewhere, by means of action, of this which appears here—this is destruction. As the *Brahma-Sūṭra* says: The disappearance of that which is in progress is destruction.

Under each of the three is a quartette: (*a*) the act of coming forth; the originator; the produced; and the progenition; (*b*) the act of preserving; the maintainer; the fostered; and the continued protection; (*c*) the destroyed; the dissolver; the disappearance; and the upayoga (? the use or purpose of the act of destruction).

Nothing in the world is stable, fixed for all time to one place; but rather, because all exists everywhere, because all have a use and purpose in all places, therefore everyone, atom or sun, is always going everywhen and everywhere. If objects were to stay for ever, each in one fixed place, then truly were karma meaningless. It may be said (by a lax use of the words 'one place,' that various kinds of activity are possible even in one place, but even so the universality of karma would remain unimpugned. Because this Self is not confined to any one place, because it is not tied to any one particular, therefore its activity is not restricted to one point of space or one moment of time or one way of motion.

Five main kinds of karma, acts,[1] are declared in the *Vaisheṣhika*: (*a*) uṭkṣhe-paṇa,

[1] A distinction is clearly intended between karma and kriyā. The former is the 'act;' the latter the 'action' or 'activity'. The former is more the visible acting; the latter, more the volition. It has been said just before, in the text, that kriyā is the nexus between kartā and karma. But the distinction is not always rigorously maintained in common usage. It is a distinction between the psychical and the physical aspects of the same event. Cognition, desire and action may be regarded as the psychical aspects; and sensation, physical craving or appetition, and act or deed as the physical aspects.

up-throwing, ascent; (*b*) a p a k ṣ h e p a ṇ a, down-throwing or descent; (*c*) k u ñ c h a n a, contraction; (*d*) p r a s ā r a ṇ a, expansion; (*e*) g a m a n a, going, motion generally. Because k a r m a is Not-Self, and that is the opposite of the One, therefore five kinds of it are suggested (to indicate endless multiplicity in reality).[1]

---

[1] No deeper reason for the quintuplicity is given here. It is probably the same, whatever it be, as that which gives us the other pentads—sensors, motors, fingers, toes, elements, extremities, the pentagonal form of the fifth race human being, 'the five pentads of consonants in the Samskṛṭ alphabet, etc.—at the present day. For a discussion as to the main kinds of movement see *The Science of Peace*, p. 241. Compare the 'vibrating' lines recorded by the ergographs, etc., of psycho-physicists, for justification of 'ascent and descent' being included as prominent kinds of activity, besides 'going' and 'expansion-contraction'. These last require no special plea. Every breathing human being is himself, every moment of his life, proof of their importance. It is also interesting to compare, in this reference, the symbology of various ancient religions, which sum up the World-process in a few diagrams, a point within a circle; a diameter within it; and a cross of diameters within it. This symbology, besides its mathematical significance, acquires a most valuable psycho-physical one when we endeavor to interpret it in the

Gamana is the chief; next in importance come expansion and contraction successively. They correspond respectively to A, U and M.

These three together make up all 'Becoming'. Look where we will in all the World-process, we can discern only these three; first a going forth, a stirring, then an expansion, then a contraction. Every morning, every evening, illustrates this. Every morning, prāṭah, is that wherein there is, prakarṣheṇa, in a high degree, āṭah or light. The time wherein light first comes forth, ā-gachchaṭi, that is moving. Then follows the prasāraṇa or expansion thereof, which makes the day. The contraction of that expansion makes the evening, the sāyam, from the verb-root siy, to sweep up, gather together, ākarṣhaṇa, attracting or drawing in.[1] For, at that time, the expanded light is contracted, gathered in and packed up to be taken away elsewhere; and, in its place, darkness comes in here. The subsequent expansion, etc., of the darkness makes the night. For this reason, light and

---

light of the verses of *Bhāvaprakāsha*, (see *The Science of Social Organisation*; *or The Laws of Manu in the Light of Theosophy*, p. 223.)

[1] There follow here some very technical grammatical considerations which cannot be adequately or usefully translated.

darkness are the main determinants of night and day. Some hold that a new day begins immediately after midnight; others, just before sunrise. The underlying idea of both views is that the 'coming' of light makes the beginning of every day. So, one day and one night, ḍivā-rāṭri, *i.e.*, one course of light and one of darkness, make one ḍivasa, one date. In that, in accordance with the rules for the calculations of mahā-manvanṭaras, etc., ṭiṭhis, *i.e.*, dates occasionally multiply, or disappear. Thus two or even three ordinary dates are counted as one; and *vice versa*; and so with the nakṣhaṭras or asterisms (roughly, fortnights). Still the date proper does not vary, and seven of these make the ahan, or week; and multiples of this, the fortnight, the month, the year, etc.[1] The full

[1] It may be noted in passing that the time-divisions and space-measures of the ancient Indians seem to have been strictly based on 'natural' processes, movements of atoms and suns and planets. Thus the ṭruṭi, the minutest division of time is the period taken by an atom—itself the smallest measure of space—to move out of the space occupied by it. The day-night consists of thirty muhūrṭas, each of forty-eight minutes, that being the daily difference in the time of rising of the moon. And so on. The 'natural' reason for the day of *twenty-four* hours, each of *sixty* minutes, is not so clear.

discussion, and the usefulness of these matters the precise significance and measure of the day, of 'to-day,' 'yesterday,' 'tomorrow,' y ā m a, or 'watch' (quarter of the day), etc., will be found in the sciences of Jyoṭiṣha or 'Astronomy,' Shilpa or 'Art-Construction,' generally, and Iṭihāsa or 'History'. In the meanwhile, we note a beginningless and endless repetition and rotation in mutual succession, of these definite beginnings and ends called day and night; which rotation is the inevitable consequence of the laws and principles embodied in the Logion. And we also note that where light ends, there darkness begins, and where darkness ends, there light begins (without any blank interval).

We may now return to the proposition that birth-life-death are one inseparate-triplet, and in their combination make s ṛ ṣ h t i, evolution, manifestation, emanation. Endless variations of these occur in the various s ṛ ṣ h t i s, world-creations or systems, details of which may be learnt from the cosmological portions of history, s r a i ṣ h ṭ i k a-i ṭ i h ā s a. Indeed, such 'variations' in evolution, by difference of time, place and need or circumstance, occur abundantly even within each b r a h m ā n d a or world-egg, with endless growth and decay of each of the endless forms of the Self, in correspondence with Its infinity. That the Self, is

infinite, is proved by this consideration: we could say that It was not infinite, but limited here and here, only if there were any existence, any a s ṭ i ṭ v a, apart from or independent of the Self. As it is, we talk and can talk of all things or any things only on the basis of the Self. Where our Self is there only can our consciousness travel. All else is as naught to us and therefore is not. We cannot speak or think of it at all. But we can talk and think of all things and anything because our Self is infinite and in touch with every possible E ṭ a ṭ, and includes all within Its consciousness; (and the '*successive*' manifestation or unfolding of this content of the Self's Consciousness which includes all possible kinds of e ṭ a ṭ-forms, types and archetypes, genera, species and individuals, and all possible ways of their evolution and involution, spontaneous generation, as well as gradual selection amidst spontaneous variation—which is nothing else than spontaneous generation of forms—makes the endless variations and varieties of the World-process).

Knowing this the j ī v a becomes equal, equable, tranquil. He knows himself as ever the same, not liable to growth and decay, outside greatness and littleness, and so passes beyond sorrow and rejoicing. To feel oneself as less than another is sorrow. As greater—joy. And the alternation

of these two feelings alone constitutes b a n ḍ-h a n a, bondage.

It is true that from the standpoint of the successive and limited, this gradation of great and little is an inevitable fact. And for 'practical' purposes, it is fit and proper to strive after an ever greater and greater ideal or status. (But even in the region of empiricism, 'practice,' the memory of the prospect beheld from the transcendental standpoint has its use. It gives us encouragement to renewed effort and consolation against failure in particular instances, and unshaken peace of mind generally, and enables us to) remember what the proverb says: "What blame is there, where is the fault, in the failure, if due effort has been made?" and (thereafter to endeavor to find out quietly where the flaw lay which prevented success, in the light of the fact) that the Whole can never be encompassed and accomplished by any one, at any time or place, by any single effort.

It has been said above that beginning and end, expansion and contraction, are included in g a m a n a. Everything is 'going,' moving, always, everywhere and ever. S a m s ā r a, s a m s a r a ṇ a, is only a synonym for g a m a n a. The distinction that is made between g a m a n a and ā g a m a n a, going and coming, is only a

matter of succession and special condition or convention. In the general sense, gamana is the one universal fact, divested of all specialisations—an infinite progress and regress. The same process may be regarded as going or as coming, regress or progress, evolution or involution, birth or death, according to the point of view taken.

As all goings and comings are dictated by the all-necessity, so particular goings and comings, the particular actions of particular individuals are governed by the particular needs and necessities of the individuals concerned; and out of such arise joys and sorrows, satisfactions and disappointments. Ordinarily people do not go where there is no necessity for them to go. But if one were needed by another for the satisfaction of some requirement of his, and came not as desired and expected, then the latter suffers disappointment: 'This need of mine could be satisfied by him alone and he comes not'. Where the need is small, the thought is different and the feeling indifferent: 'If he comes, well and good; otherwise it does not seriously matter; the main event will take place, the general idea carried out, even without him or any one else in particular.' To the jīva which has attained to the knowledge of Brahman, the latter is the permanent mood,

in a more comprehensive form: 'The comers will come and the goers will go; births and deaths will take place endlessly; and the All-Necessity will ever surely fulfil Itself. There is no need to rejoice or to grieve overmuch over any particular coming or going.'

When two necessities join into one, and become a mutual necessity, then relationships and friendships arise, and 'wel-comings' and 'ill-comings'.[1] Where the want of visitor and receiver is a common one, there occurs 'wel-come'. Where it is otherwise we have 'ill-come,' 'ill-omen'. The contradiction of the unity of the well and good, the s h u b h a, is the ill or evil, the a-s h u b h a.

The triplet here is g a m a n a (? in the sense

[1] To the modern reader all this ringing of changes on 'coming' and 'going' in connexion with metaphysic may appear trivial. It is the 'manner' of the book and it has a significance to the sympathetic reader. It will enable him to see how the principles of metaphysic govern the so-called little and trivial as well as the so-called great and important. 'Comings' and 'goings' are the 'births' and 'deaths' of worlds also. The very purpose of this chapter will have been missed by the reader if he does not see that to raise his mind above thoughts of the conventional 'little' and 'great,' words have to be used which apply indifferently to both.

of ā-gamana or coming), an-ā-gamana or non-coming, and pra-gamana or strenuous going—corresponding to A, U and M, respectively. Gamana is the summation of them all. It is the whole of karma, eternal and universal. All sub-divisions of it, and oppositions distinguished between these sub-divisions are nothing else than itself. The going of light is darkness; and the going of darkness is light; both are relative; and indeed, looked at thus, the two are one, for there must be an underlying unity wherever there is a relation. The general principle has been expounded before that everything includes, and therefore is, its opposite. By that principle are all separates ever threaded together and they ever interpenetrate each other. Hence the saying that night and day, evening and morning, sun and moon, all exist everywhere, and that there is darkness in the sun and moon as well as light.[1]

To dwell for another moment on prasāraṇa, expansion, which may be regarded, in one

---

[1] These may be regarded as statements of particular, concrete facts as well as metaphysical or abstract principles. Fournier's "Two New Worlds" speaks of supra-light and infra-light. X-rays and N-rays are nearer to us. That sunset in one place means sunrise in another, every school-boy knows.

sense, *i.e.*, from the point of view of our progressive evolution, as of most importance to us. It has been said before that it is a sub-division, a kind, of g a m a n a. The stretching out or spreading forth of 'this definite something' that is 'now here' as 'such-and-such,' (into something more that is at other times and elsewhere also)—this is expansion. The *Mīmāmsā* says, no doubt, that a thing is (and must therefore always be) as it is, and stretching or spreading forth of it is not possible.[1] (But this is so only from one

[1] यो हि यादृशः स तादृश एव, 'A thing is as it is.' This is the nearest Samskṛṭ statement available, so far as I am aware, of the 'law of thought' so current in modern logic since Aristotle, 'A is A'. Other and less bare aspects of it are very frequently to be met, *e.g.*, *Bhagavaḍ-Gīṭā*, ii. 16, "The existent cannot perish, the non-existent cannot become existent," etc. But in its precise modern form this Law of Identity, with its two companion Laws of Contradiction and Excluded Middle, is not to be met with in Samskṛṭ—apparently because of their utter barrenness for all practical purposes. This sterility of theirs was emphasised by Hegel and is being recognised by logicians generally now in the West, and they are being more or less thrown aside—by another extreme of reaction. They, that is to say, the essential idea they embody, *has* a most distinct value—*but* for

standpoint.) From the standpoint of the Inner Self, Praṭyagāṭmā, such expansion of everything is necessary and unavoidable, in order that the Unity of that Self may be opposed and realised (by means of that false, futile and ever-refuted opposition) at all points of time and space. As the *Vaisheṣhika* says: The visṭāra, spreading out of objects, is prasāraṇa. Or as the *Brahma-Sūṭra*: The feeling, the experiencing, of the unity of the elements of I and This is prasāraṇa.[1] That is to say,

---

purposes of transcendental metaphysic. Because our inmost soul feels that "A is A," and not only now, but always; that A is not only not not-A *now*, but can *never become* anything else than A; therefore are we able to rise to the Logion which is the solution of the riddle of the universe. But Aristotle, if we may judge by results, seems to have missed this most important significance of these laws—when he probably received the original forms of them from India, at the time of the Alexandrian invasion and tried to apply them to the uses of the "understanding," instead of the "Reason," to manas instead of buḍḍhi, to manas which would lose its vocation if A remained A and was not constantly becoming something more or something other than A, becoming not-A, (and yet remaining A!).

[1] The next sentence of the text gives the immediately relevant aspect of the sense of this pronounce-

the endless experiences of the jīvāṭmā, 'this is so and so and such and such and he and I and they are so and so and such and such'—all this multitude of experience makes the complexity, the quintuplicity, pra-pañcha, of the World-process; and this pra-pañcha itself is pra-sāraṇa.

We may distinguish four forms of it: (i) vi-pra-sāraṇa; (ii) sāraṇa; (iii) vi-sāraṇa; and (iv) pra-sāraṇa, corresponding respectively to A, U, M and the Totality. The first is 'expansion in an excessive manner'; it is the ideation of all work in an unlimited, un-de-termined and comprehensive fashion. The second is ordinary movement. The third is withdrawal from movement or movement in an opposite direction: 'What is the use of this (particular) effort? (let us try another).' The fourth includes all the others.

The opposite of pra-sāraṇa is kuñchana.

---

ment. For other aspects we might consult other parts of the text, and independent works also, *e.g.*, the *Mahā-Upanishat*, chapters v. and vi., where different kinds of aham-kāra, 'I-ness,' are described, and how the I-ness which is identified with this handful of flesh and blood and bone which is our passing dress but which we identify ourselves with, makes for bondage, while certain other forms of I-ness make for liberation, one being 'I am all'.

It is the reduction of all things to unity, contraction, shrinking up, re-absorption. It is pralaya. It also has four sub-divisions. (i) Pra-kuñchana; (ii) vi-kuñchana; (iii) ava-kuñchana; and (iv) kuñchana, corresponding respectively to A, U, M and the Totality. The first refers to the highest, the transcendent Unity. The second to particular diminutions. The third is present at all times, in all actions, with every work (as katabolism in all vital functioning). Ālasya, indolence, unwillingness, disinclination or indisposition to work, fatigue and laziness, regardless of the need for exertion and careless of propriety and opportuneness or otherwise—this is the characteristic of the third or ava-kuñchana, 'what is to happen, will happen,' 'let what will, take place'. Activity, the feeling of fitness and energy, the eagerness for work, is its opposite. Both these are present and needed in the World-process for the work of the Self. In consequence of the unwillingness to act which characterises ava-kuñchana, there arises the feeling that to rest inactive is happiness, as when people say: 'Happy is he to sleep so peacefully, relieved of restless action'.[1] But it is not possible to remain in this condition

[1] Compare Shakespeare's line: "After life's fitful fever he sleeps well."

either, permanently. When the time for it comes round the power of prasāraṇa impels the jīva irresistibly again. Too much of 'sleeping' has its own obvious evil consequences. As medical science, forbidding excess of every kind, of activity as well as laziness, points out, diseases arise from too much sleep as from too much waking. Vāṭa-pramī (nervous disorders) are thus caused, says Ḍhanvanṭari. The *Samhiṭā-Sūṭra* says: Too much sleep and unwillingness to move, sedentary habits, cause prameha (albuminaria) and so on. The fourth, kuñchana is the summation of all.

The need of, the 'looking' by, the I *for* the eṭat is gamana. The necessity, the energy, of the I *in* the eṭaṭ is prasāraṇa. 'This-not-I,' the negation of the eṭaṭ, the negation of the Aham—this is kuñchana. The whole of the Logion-fact, 'I-This-Not' is karma. In other words: 'I-(am) this-thus' is gamana. 'This (more am)-I-(and) not thus (only)' is prasāraṇa. 'This-(am) not-I thus, nor thus, nor otherwise'—is kuñchana. In these ways is the whole of the World-process carried on.

But verily:

This Self is not expanse of spreading light,
Nor point of concentrated darkness is It,

Nor scale of time, day, month and year and
age,
Nor space measured by suns and vaster suns,
Nor knows It any ascent or descent,
Nor evolution, involution, arc
Of growth, decay, or going anywise,
Expansion and contraction It knows not,
Nor joy elating, nor depressing grief—
Ever at rest, eternally complete.

CHAPTER XXIV.

THE PRINCIPAL FORMS OF KRIYĀ.

The four sub-divisions of k r i y ā.—Similar sub-divisions of cognition and desire.—(i.) K r i y ā, its nature and significance.—(ii.) P r a ṭ i k r i y ā.—(iii.) V i k r i y ā.—(iv.) U p a k r i y ā.—The synthesis of the four in an endless chain of cause and effect.—The mutual relation of motionlessness and incessant movements, as that of substance and attribute.—Manifestations of k r i y ā as human k a r m a and arts.

The sub-divisions of k a r m a have been dealt with in the preceding chapter. In k r i y ā also we may distinguish four sub-divisions: (i.) kriyā, action; (ii.) praṭikriyā, reaction; (iii.) vikriyā, change, transformation; (iv.) upakriyā, 'all-helping,' 'acting near or around or for all,' beneficence, philanthropy. These correspond to A, U, M and the Total respectively. The k r i y ā n ṭ a r a, 'another action' that immediately follows after an action or k r i y ā, is the p r a ṭ i k r i y ā, the reaction. In p r a ṭ i-k r i y ā, the manifestation is similar to, on the same lines as, that of k r i y ā (but inversed or reversed, as a reflexion). The first form is k r i y ā; residing within it as its opposite is

But why do we not have similar sub-divisions under j ñ ā n a, cognition, etc.? Why do we not have p r a ṭ i-j ñ ā n a and the rest? Truly we do have them; only convention finds it more convenient to express them by the use of such adjectives as s a ṭ and a s a ṭ, true and false etc.[1] In combination with k r i y ā only is the prefix p r a ṭ i used specially, because k r i y ā is a matter of outward (visible) contact and manifests in overt movement (and the connotation of p r a ṭ i is that of 'facing towards,' 'confronting,' opposing overtly, also).

But might it not be said that cognition, etc., have also a similar origin (in the 'facing' each other of the Self and the Not-Self)? True; still we might also say that by a special and predominant connexion with the inner Self, they have a kind of (comparative)

[1] In current Samskṛṭ, p r a ṭ i j ñ ā (the more common form as against p r a ṭ i j ñ ā n a) means 'promise'; v i j ñ ā n a, special knowledge, knowledge of concrete details; and u p a j ñ ā n a, invention. Error, as opposite to truth, is spoken of as a-j ñ ā n a, which is also used for non-knowledge or ignorance. For 'practical' purposes, negative ignorance in action is and becomes positive error. So, perhaps, under i c h c h h ā we may distinguish like, dislike, tolerance (or indifference in a certain sense) and general benevolence.

independence (of the outer world). While undoubtedly k r i y ā arises out of the entrance into partnership, the co-operation, the joint business, of the Self and the Not-Self, still, this statement does not lessen the high status of the Self. For the Self is all-inclusively distinct from all and is eternal, while the Not-Self is dependent on another, on the Self. Even while inseparably united and indeed one, yet are the two as end and means, organism and organ.[1]

---

[1] In other words, though all the three phases or aspects of consciousness arise in the interplay of subject and object, and from the transcendental standpoint are on the same level, equally overt or equally covert; yet from the empirical standpoint, cognition is *more* inner than outer, and action is more outer than inner, while desire stands midway and holds together both. As said again and again in the text, cognition corresponds with the Self, action with the Not-Self, desire with Negation. So, although from the transcendental standpoint, the Trinity are all equal and none is greater than the other and we can make no distinctions, yet, from the empirical standpoint, we cannot help feeling that the Self is *more we* ourselves than the Not-Self is. *For us*, the Self is *more* important. By our verbal expansion and description of the Logion, the Self posits and negates the Not-Self, not *vice versa*. The Self is the Master, the Self-dependent. The

These four, *kriyā*, etc., may be described in terms of the Logion as below :

'I am this thus'—is *kriyā*. For, see. There is I within I, and 'this' within 'this,' and 'not' within 'not'. And the significance of an I within an I is that the unity of the I is contradicted. 'I am one' is not a fact ; but, rather, there is another I within that I and that is the 'this'. So again, there is a further 'this' within the 'this,' and this second 'this' is the 'thus,' *iṭṭham*. When the question is asked 'How is there an I within an I,' then the answer is 'thus'. And this is *kriyā*.[1]

Not-Self is dependent on the Self. If the Self is dependent at all on the Not-Self, It is so dependent only for Its Self-manifestation, as an end on a means; whereas the Not-Self, is dependent on the Self for very existence, fleeting and ever-negated, a mere passing (though endlessly passing) breath of existence as it is. And so on.

[1] All this portion of the text is difficult to follow, with its subtle playing with and ringing of changes on the words of the Logion. I have tried to make the translation as literal as possible, to give the reader the chance of 'construing' for himself. The description of *kriyā* may be paraphrased thus. The essential idea of all action, of all 'movement,' is self-realisation, self-manifestation, by means of successive identification of the self with various

'I am thus and this is thus' is praṭikriyā. As the question is asked, 'How is (or am) I' and again, 'How is there an I again within that I,' the answer comes up, 'I am thus, because I am the Self, universal, omnipresent, *i.e.*, I am in all and all is in I, and there is no difference between all and I.' In this way, to say that 'I am thus' is to indicate the condition of another I included within an I; and again to say that 'this is thus' is to indicate the condition of still another I within the second I; and another within that; and so on endlessly. For the World-process is made up of the interplay of I's beyond count. And this lack of finality itself, this anavasṭhā, this infinite *regressus* is praṭikriyā.[1]

'this's,' bodies, sheaths: I am a mineral, I am a vegetable, I am an animal, I am a man, I am a god and so on. At each successive step, the ego discovers greater depths and potentialities within itself, and unfolds them. Another aspect of this same general idea is the ego's transference of its centre of consciousness to sheath within sheath, subtler and subtler, from physical to astral, thence to mental, etc., on the nivṛṭṭi path, as it performed the reverse process on the pravṛṭṭi path, transferring the centre of consciousness to sheath without sheath.

[1] One way of describing the intention of the text here would probably be that the resistance offered

Vikriyā is 'I-this-thus-not' *i.e.*, I am not this thus. Whatever condition one arrives into, becomes 'unbearable,' 'bearable with difficulty,' prasahya, (in the sense almost of a-sahya), forced, unpleasant, before long. The jīva does not find 'complete satisfaction' (which belongs only to the Pratyagātmā-state, while the jīva in its small sheath is the reverse of complete) in that state, but forthwith begins to long

by the Whole, the Universal aspect of the I, to each change of each part or small I, constitutes reaction, and is the cause of the nullification of the previous kriyâ of identification of a self with a particular sheath. In other words, it is the backward swing constituted by the second half of the Logion, opposing the forward swing made by its first half. So viewed, pratikriyâ appears the natural supplement of kriyâ as described in the preceding footnote, as fittingly as in the wording of the text. It should be noted that because this backward swing *op-poses* the forward, positively, therefore it becomes an 'inversion,' a 'reflexion' of it and puts on an 'appearance' like that of the forward one and does not become a mere, pure negative and universal abolition. Hence the annulment and repudiation of one identification becomes, not no-identification, but identification with another, an opposite, and so on.

Hence too the reference to the 'condition' of another I within an I, etc. On this point, to the two aspects noted in the preceding footnote may be added the

for another. By this greed and discontent, the existing condition is naturally destroyed. I ṭ-ṭ h a m, 'thus,' means nothing else than an a v a s ṭ h ā, condition, fixed state, 'standing'. 'I am thus' means 'such is my condition'. Consequently 'I am not thus,' 'this is not thus,' is the form of v i k r i y ā (which primarily means

---

following consideration: When we endeavor to describe the 'condition' of a thing, we imply tacitly that the 'thing' is something permanent and single and has or owns and possesses many modes which are its conditions. Now each of these modes may be regarded as, and indeed is, the thing itself, and yet is distinguishable from it. 'How am I?,' 'I am well,' 'I am ill,' 'I am glad,' 'I am sad,' etc. Here, all five I's are one and the same, and yet it may be said that the last four I's are differént from each other and from the first, and are included in that first. The primal archetype of the distinction between substance or substratum and attribute is the distinction (without separability) between Self and Not-Self. 'Thing' and 'qualities'—is the reflexion of that in the limited. All the evolutionary and involutionary experiences that the j ī v a passes through, all the endless bodies it puts on and discards, are its 'attributes,' qualities, with itself as 'substance' or substratum, are the all-possible pseudo-infinite possibilities stored within each one, each atom, each 'biophorid,' which it successively unfolds from within itself and enfolds back again.

change, transformation, and secondarily 'evil change,' degeneration, corruption, also).

Upa-kriyā is 'I-am-(all) This, Not-thus-Nor-that (other) way, nor like (this), nor otherwise' (but in all ways; I am, somehow, anyhow, and it does not matter at all in what particular way).[1] This is why even the 'knowers' say: 'Whatever condition you are in, stay there; what is the use of this, or that, or another?; the scheme of affairs is sure to be carried out in accordance with destiny, the to-be; what is the use of striving otherwise'? Of course, the obvious reply to this is that the striving, the effort to change the condition, is also in accordance with and induced by the 'to-be,' and the 'knower's' statement is therefore meaningless. But it is justified (or at least the fact that such statements are made is explained) by paribhrama-vyavahāra, the 'behavior' or conventions of illusion.[2] Even the knowers

[1] One way of interpreting this sentence, in consonance with the modern use of the word upakāra, 'doing a good deed to help another,' would be this: 'I am always full of satisfaction, for even in my loss I have the consolation that my loss is necessarily another's gain; if I have lost in this body, the same I have gained in that other body, all I's being the same I.'

[2] The statement here is rather puzzling. It may

suffer illusion, bhrama, 'wandering,' 'going astray,' 'going round and round,' in this transcendental endlessness of the World-process. Indeed, everyone is sarva-jña, omniscient, and at the same time ignorant and 'little-knowing,' alpa-jña. Whatever condition one has attained to, he is omniscient as regards all conditions preceding, and ignorant as regards those succeeding it. Only this (comparative) omniscience (the full recovery of the knowledge, the memory, of the past) is the net result of yoga. Hence yogīs too are said to be only 'little-knowing'

---

be interpreted thus: After knowledge of the final truth has been attained, the proper attitude in 'practical' matters is that we should exercise our best judgment, and base exertion, and take action, by all means, on the data available to us, in each particular situation—such judgment and exertion being also included in the all-destiny; and that we should do so *without fret or worry* over consequences, *without feverish cravings*, anxieties and regrets. But, in the confusion of the moment, when trying to *warn* or *console* another against such frets and regrets, even the 'knower' often states the right conclusion with wrong premises! He confuses the consolatory with the directive or mandatory, and the past with the future—by an illusive imitation within the limited of what is absolutely true in and only in and of the whole.

—for knowledge by a limited, embodied individual, of the unlimited Whole (in its endless details) is impossible.

The synthesis, the co-ordination, of this endless activity in all its forms is possible and actually takes place in the way of cause and effect; this arises from or out of this, and this other from another—and so on. And the 'practical' teaching to be inferred from all the above, its 'pragmatic' bearing, is that we should abandon the three others and take refuge in u p a-k r i y ā, action near and for all, that impartially benefits all and leads each to a happiness that is shared in common with all and is not separate for each.

As said before, the essential significance of k r i y ā is, of course, the omnipresence of the Self, and the necessity of 'becoming' everywhere, concomitantly with that omnipresence; for existence, a s ṭ i ṭ v a, is-ness, is manifestation, working, activity; existence being impossible without action. Yet, distinguishing between the two, we may say that in the aspect of mere a s ṭ i ṭ v a, the World-process is a motionlessness; and that the s v a-b h ā v a, the nature or character of that a s ṭ i ṭ v a and motionlessness is incessant activity. One law of all activity is that everything goes back to the condition in or from which it began. Thus,

a m a h ā-m a n v a n ṭ a r a oegins (in the ending) and ends in the beginning of another m a h ā-m a n v a n ṭ a r a. Or, again, a child is born, *i.e.*, begins to exist out of non-existence, and after living its life as a human, again goes back into the non-existence out of which it came. Or, from another standpoint, everything comes out, lives in and goes back into existence, b h ā v a, being. Or, yet again, nothing ever comes forth, or stays, or departs. Thus does action arise out of actionlessness and go back into it. This change of form, r ū-p ā n ṭ a r a, is v i k r i y ā.

The (inner) nature of k r i y ā in its aspect of human (ethical) k a r m a is duly expounded in the *Mīmāmsā*. Its (outer) forms, changes and transformations, should be studied in the *Shilpa-Shāsṭra*, applied sciences and arts. And because the essence and even the details of it are present in every atom, therefore is it declared that there is p u ṇ y a, merit, in the observation of even a single atom (being the indispensable preparation for all-knowledge). As the Scriptures declare: Behold B r a h m a n in every atom, know the atom, know the super-atom; therein is knowledge, therein science.

It may be noted that each kind of activity defines, outlines, gives name and form to, the

world in its own terms. Hence we have the expressions—the world of knowledge, the world of action, the world of desire, the world of science, the world of language, etc. Yet all in truth are always threaded on the P r a ṭ y a-g ā ṭ m ā.

CHAPTER XXV.

THE METAPHYSIC OF KRIYĀ IN PRACTICE.

Existence and Non-Existence.

Resumé ?—Distinction between kriyā and karma. —Karma, the manifestation of the strongest desire.—Strongest desire makes character, svabhāva, for the time.—Sva-bhāva, not a pure unity, but a unity in diversity, in the individual as well as the Universal.—Metaphysical considerations.—Their application to practice.—Vārṭā, mutual commerce, the embodiment of the constant endeavor of the one to encompass the all.—Knowledge and speech as action and reaction.—The Science of Brahman, the final and all-comprehensive 'commerce'.—Even the unbeliever unconsciously believes in this Thread of Continuity, of unity in diversity, the Universal Self or Consciousness.—Metaphysical reconciliation of change and changelessness, motion in motionlessness, action out of the actionless.—Existence and non-existence, plenum and vacuum, ever and never, inseparable in the Absolute.—Nature of the illusion of succession, growth and decay.—Growth and activity of Mahā-Viṣhṇu.—The meaning of omniscience.—The destined progress of all jīvas to the status of Mahā-Viṣhṇu.

In the preceding chapters we have examined the nature of kriyā and of karma. It may be repeated here that that which is most desired of the Self—that is karma. In other words we do only that which we most desire to do. The strongest motive, the most powerful desire, pushes the others aside and finds vent for itself in outward act. Therefore the essence of karma is sva-bhāva, 'own-being,' nature, character. (Our character, at any given time, is constituted by our deepest desire).[1] But to this it

---

[1] See *The Science of the Emotions*, chapter vii. The student who examines these sentences closely will make a pleasant discovery of how the opposed views, 'antinomies of the reason,' regarding predestination and free exertion, ingrained character and ability to change it, ruling passion and overruling will, merge into each other, as usual, and are reconciled, along the lines of psycho-philology. The word karma, it will have been noticed, is used in various senses, of course allied with each other. Any particular action of a living being is a karma. Any movement of a piece of apparently inanimate matter, is also a karma. The 'fruit'-bearing deeds of responsible human or other beings, deeds which are invested with an ethical value, and, as meritorious or sinful, have a future reactive consequence for the doer, in pleasure or pain, are also karma. Kriyâ is also used in

may be objected that the activity in or of svabhāva is one, unique, uniform; there is no duality in it; it all svayam bhavaṭi, 'itself becomes'; it is the becoming, the unfolding of one character, the development of one inner nature; it 'maintains itself'; and so on. Whence then the duality (or rather the multiplicity, the change, which is essentially opposed to unity? The answer is that the duality bases on the One and the One on duality, and *both together*, as included in Universal Being, make up and are designated as svabhāva (for pure unity without any change were devoid of character, character being nothing else than a fixed way of becoming, bhavana, manifestation, action). This that we see as a duality is unity, and *vice-versa.*[1] (The

---

varying senses, but almost never in the last sense, seldom in the second, and more often in the first. In the two triplets, jñāna-ichchhā-kriyā and ḍravya-guṇa-karma, the distinction is obvious between kriyā and karma. And that distinction seems to underlie all the shades of meaning of each in use, *viz.*, that the psychic or conscious aspect goes most with kriyā and the material one with karma. The root of both is the same, philologically and metaphysically.

[1] All this only rings ever new changes on the ultimate and crucial metaphysical problem, the why

'unity' of character consists in acting in one fixed way, under the dominance of one fixed desire or idea, in varying circumstances; and because the unity and fixity of any desire are only pseudo-unity and comparative-fixity, an imitation or reflexion of the True Unity and Fixity, therefore these change also, more slowly). In their ḍ h a r m a, functioning, the two are one. (Duality in unity, unity in duality, similarity in diversity, make up a new synthesis or uniformity). And, in accordance with this unity, all this endless appearance and disappearance, existence and non-existence—all 'becomes' a matter of S v a-b h ā v a. Hence has it been said: There is no duality, no unity, no manyness—All is S v a-b h ā v a and S v a-b h ā v a only.

Because this duality is always founded on a unity, there is not a single atom which is not and which does not behave as dual. And where

---

and the how of the World-process, the reconciliation of change and changelessness, endless movements and motionlessness, permanent substratum and fleeting attributes—as spoken of at the end of the last chapter. To solve that problem is to solve all else. To leave that unsolved, is to leave all perplexed and ununderstood. See *The Science of Peace*, ch. vi, 78–82. The text here will throw much light on the word s v a-b h â v a (Svabhavat) so much used in *The Secret Doctrine*.

there are two, there is always a third, as the M. Hence we find that all ḍ h a r m a, all function, or the functioning of the all, is in operation everywhere.[1] The very root of all k a r m a is therefore the duality of unity (the binding up of the Self and the Not-Self in the Self).

The Self is unlimited, inseparate from all, containing and contained in all, all-transcendent. The This, on the other hand, is limited and limited in every way, by its opposition to the Unity of the Self. Limitation is the having of a beginning and an end. And such beginning and end belong to and are in the This only. The Self is beyond them. How then may the 'work' of the Unlimited be effected in the Limited? Thus, *viz.*, the e ṭ a ṭ becomes endless, in an unlimited 'becoming' of pseudo-infinite beginnings and endings. Its 'becoming,' as one general or universal activity, is endless; but each particular 'become' is limited. Itself essentially limited, yet by its tie with the Self, the e ṭ a ṭ acquires the appearance of unlimitedness, end-

---

[1] Another way of putting the principle that all is everywhere and always. Various aspects of the fact stated as that 'every atom is dual' may be regarded as 'male-and-female,' 'soul-and-body,' 'core-and-crust,' 'inner-and-outer,' 'subtler-and-denser,' etc.

lessness. The 'many' are endless, unlimited, pseudo-infinite in number, and yet they are also a one each—without any inconsistency. Such is the oneness, unity, union, of the I and the This. Everywhere are they together, (inseparable though distinguishable). Never, nowhere, nowise is the one without the other. Because of this indefeasible fact, the Many This, in imitation of the One Self, also assumes endlessness. But at the same time is it always Not. And so we have the whole reduced to unity again. And he who realises this unity—he is the true p a ṇ d i ṭ a, he only is dutiful, he is good, he is wise, he is free, he knows the true knowledge, he is fit for the highest offices.[1]

But how can we talk at all about the Endless and the Transcendent? The e ṭ a ṭ is limited

---

[1] The members of the spiritual hierarchies which guide and govern the affairs of a world-system are recruited from the ranks of those who have attained the due qualification of this most vital of all acquirements, *viz.*, Self-Knowledge. Hence, in the system of Sanāṭana Ḍharma, is so much stress laid on the attainment of right knowledge, and the craving after superphysical powers so much condemned. The j ī v a s who least want powers are those best fitted to be invested with them, in these regions especially; for they only can be trusted to wield them altruistically.

and should not we (who are, to all appearance, so very limited in every respect, size, lifetime, powers) should talk only about the limited? The reply is that we may rightly make inferences about the unlimited (*i.e.*, numberless possible future and as yet unknown situations, with reference to k r i y ā) from the data we have about the limited (because we are, *i.e.*, the I in us is not Limited but veritably the Unlimited). Regarding one-self as similar, indeed the same, (in all situations as in any one), every one ought to carry on his work. Such a statement, however, it should be kept in mind, only enables us to find the peace of rest in the knowledge of the main principles underlying the World-process. Otherwise, indeed, as often said before, the full knowledge of *all* details being unavailable to *any one* individual, all speech (affirming any fact or recommending any course, or the opposite) must be held to be defective, vitiated by ignorance and therefore reprehensible. This is not so, however; and v ā r ṭ ā, the 'happening,' the mutual converse and commerce of the world, is an invincible and most justifiable fact, without which there were only p r a l a y a and universal dissolution. So long as the World-system exists, so long must there be v ā r ṭ ā,[1] *i.e.*,

[1] This word means converse, commerce, intercourse by language as well as by trade, in words

a n v ā ḍ e s h a, the repeated reiteration of an utterance. The description in words of a work undertaken (or desired) is the result of v ā r ṭ ā. And such conversation to and fro is the result of the operations of action and reaction. Some accomplish this intercourse with labor and effort, others naturally and with ease. But the difference is only one of manner. All have to perform it in some way or other.

Two kinds are distinguished in v ā r ṭ ā, *viz.*, s a ṭ and a s a ṭ, true and false or good and evil. But both are matter of necessity; (*i.e.*, the distinction arises out of considerations of necessity, both are necessary, and yet in this way that) when in any particular situation, in view of the need of the moment, any talk happens to be not immediately necessary, then it is said to be false or useless and advice is given against indulging in it; and when, on the other hand, the conversation is relevant and appropriate to the time, and of interest to both the parties concerned in it, it is said to be good and true, and is recommended and promoted instead of being forbidden.

---

and in merchandise. Its root v ṛ ṭ, to exist, to come forth, to circulate, is probably the same from which come the English words, converse, perverse, reverse, inverse, etc. It should be remembered that language indicates the needs of living beings to each other, and trade and commerce fulfil them.

By means of such commerce (intellectual and economical) are mutual needs fulfilled or defeated, friendships or hostilities created, depression or elation, joy or sorrow experienced in the way of action and reaction. As the *Brahma-sūṭra* says: V ā r ṭ ā derives its v i b h ū ṭ i, richness, wealth, from action and reaction. And the *Mīmāmsā*: V ā r ṭ ā arises and appears out of cognition, action and desire. And the *Veḍa*: V ā r ṭ ā is defined or pointed out by k r i y ā and p r a ṭ i-k r i y ā.

We may understand the significance and propriety of advice, admonition, expostulation, etc., by reference to these facts. Otherwise, indeed, it may well be said that all things happen by destination and necessity, and counsel is useless—though to that too could be given the reply in coin that instruction and direction and remonstrance are also part of the same destiny.

Whatever happens, has happened, or will happen—the accurate description thereof is v ā r ṭ ā. The pointing out of consequences, by means of such description, is advice or instruction. The duty, responsibility, office, a ḍ h i k ā r a, of giving such instruction, without any personal and selfish motive, and without any consideration of whether anyone listens to and follows it or does

not, but solely from a recognition of the fact of the unity of all and the consequent need and propriety of each helping all else to the best of his ability—such duty is imposed upon every one who is invested with the right, the privilege, the power of discoursing or of composing works, wherefrom all jīvas may learn the vārtā of the World-process. He who fails to fulfil the duty, having the power—he opposes the 'to-be,' the law, and incurs sin and penalty.[1]

[1] The reader will have noted how the thought, beginning with universal Kriyâ, an all-embracing universal and incessant movement, in a semi-mechanical aspect, has gradually passed on to more 'conscious' intercourse and has now arrived at considerations of fully 'conscious' human relations with each other in an ethical sense. As pointed out in a previous note, the difference between 'mechanical' or 'automatic' and 'conscious' or 'initiative' is the difference between the 'Absolute Consciousness or Unconsciousness,' just as we like to call it, and 'individualised consciousness'. A few words may be said here on Thought passing along words. Any one who will examine any series of controversial debates and critiques will find over and over again that the whole dispute turns upon the significance of one or two important words. If the disputants would look back into their own minds and ask themselves, 'What do I really understand by such and such words and what does my

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

able to exchange thoughts with any such).[1]

When we look upon j ñ ā n a, cogni-*tion*, know-*ing*, as an aspect or mode of k r i y ā, then speech, the utterance and expression of that knowledge is to be looked upon as the reaction thereof, its p r a ṭ i-k r i y ā. (Knowledge is taking in information; speech is giving out the same.)

Works on sciences and arts, books and treatises of all kinds, come to be composed in accordance with these facts, with reference to special cyclic needs and conditions. When by lapse of time and change of conditions, the sense of any particular treatise becomes unintelligible or doubtful, then the hierarchs, the rulers of the epoch concerned, cause commentaries to be written and explanations given. It is true that sometimes such commentaries, etc., may be written out of mere pride and conceit, or a desire for praise and honor or other such worldly motive or purpose. But even so they are part of the general scheme of the World-process. The good in such books too lasts and helps others; and the author, after receiving honor receives contempt, and, forced back

[1] See the *Science of the Emotions*, 2nd edn., chap. xii., pp. 215-216; also the *Science of Peace*, ch. iv., p. 24.

into reflexion within himself, into introspection, sooner or later finds correction of the false and evil elements in his thought and motive, (which inevitably evoke the contempt, in obedience to subtle psychological laws) and his illusion too is dispelled after having had its day, for it too has a place in the universal scheme.[1]

---

[1] What a lofty conception of the high mission of authorship, the beneficent purpose of literature, this paragraph embodies! How much in contrast with the conditions of to-day when everyone thinks his thoughts good enough to 'rush into print' with, regardless of the terrible waste of time and vitality involved to all concerned in the production of a work that is not really good! And yet how patriarchally tender to even this feverish rush to display before the public, as of little children all crying 'I' and 'I' and 'I'! And not only tender but true, for, after all, the children too are jīvas, have occupied in the past, and will occupy again, in the future, stages of the highest knowledge; and every thought of any one has an element of truth in it! And not only true as a present fact, but true as a fact influencing future evolution—for all this feverish activity of the individualised egoistic intelligence, the fifth principle, when cured by the 'contempt' and frustration that comes without fail, itself becomes chastened into the sixth principle, loving and humble wisdom, out of

In its highest, most complete and ultimate form, this vārṭā is Brahma-viḍyā itself, wherein is no illusion. And it is a secret science, a science that ought to be kept secret; that is to say, should be imparted only to the deserving, the well-qualified, those that have the aḍhikāra, the right and title to it. The Science of Brahman is regarded as thus specially reserved only because, for the comprehension of this all-inclusive science, an intenser longing after knowledge than is needed for the other partial sciences is an indispensable requisite as preparation. Otherwise, and in a general sense, verily every science is useless for and should be withheld from everyone who has no desire for it, and hence the express

---

which shall grow the new and happier race! The sage Gârgyāyaṇa must have cast a glance at the then future conditions of to-day, and seen its virulence of mutual criticism, when he recorded the 'contempt'!

By introspection, self-examination, and the discovery of the common sense of words, in the light of the Common Self only, may this fever of egoistic self-opinionatedness, which looks but at the outside surface of words and things, be finally remedied, the preliminary medicine being the 'contempt' received from others and the resulting frustration of conceit, and pain and vairāgya.

injunction upon all teachers to commence teaching only after a due investigation of what the would-be student wants to learn and what his mental and bodily habits and conditions are.

In such considerations as these we realise how practice depends on theory and metaphysic, how all the World-process hangs on the Praṇava, how it threads together the Many and the One, and how desirable it is for all most earnestly to try to understand it. The final proof—if it were wanted—of this is that even the nāsṭika, the all-denier, the all-sceptic and unbeliever, utters discourses and writes treatises. Believing not in Brahman, not in the Self, nor in the Not-Self, nor in the Negation, he still wishes others to accept his views! If indeed it be, as he thinks, that there is no nexus, no relationship, no bond or thread of continuity, no unity in diversity, amidst things, nothing behind and beyond the immediate presentation of a sense, the immediate sensation, if all are disjointed and independent, why and with hope of what fruit this eagerness of his to instruct others? The truth is that the Self in such an one forces Itself forth in his life and makes the outer man instinctively act upon the sense of the indefeasible unity of himself with other jīvas—

the stage of all-denying also being part of the scheme of the World-process like all things else.

We thus see also that, of an exposition of the Praṇava, a brief description of the main principles of the World-process (as well as of the main outlines of a single world-system), in terms of the limited, is but an essential part. (The general principles are identical, for all world-systems, for every part of the World-process; the type is the same, the law is one; the details are endless.) The understanding of one helps us to understand all and to see that the Limited is Not.

How can 'is' and 'not' be combined in one expression? We can understand this only by following very closely the Science of the Praṇava. Even the 'unbelievable' is 'believable,' for the time being, for the full understanding of its nature as 'unbelievable' and of that of the opposite as 'believable'. A wrong hypothesis has to be 'held'—'let us assume for the moment,' 'suppose'—before it can be and till it is refuted. Those who have to expound the why and wherefore of the World-process have to lead thought along some such lines as these: All this that is pratyakṣha, there before our senses, directly perceptible—if all this were not, were abolished and annihilated,

what would happen then; and when it was not, if ever it was absent, what was the condition of affairs then? Let us suppose that there was nothing at first; only emptiness, like ā k ā s h a, space, no appearance, a n u b h ā s a, of darkness, none of light, not even the 'appearance' of space, but only *like* it. (Then, after making this supposition, we as the next step begin to examine it.) It may be said that in the Endless and Transcendent, activity is always going on, and nothingness cannot be assumed at any time. Yet, on the other hand, it may also be said that as p r a b h a v a, manifestation, emanation, existence, becoming forth, (plenum) is endless, in the same way s h ū n y a, vacuum, is also endless, (as an indispensable counterfoil and background). For if we say that only 'is' (plenum) is fact and never the 'is-not,' (vacuum), then *where* would all these pseudo-infinite manifestations throughout pseudo-infinite time find standing-place? They indispensably require a vacuum, an empty place and space, a 'non-existence,' to 'exist in'. And because of this, for practical purposes of description, the endless and uniform vacuum of space and nothingness is assumed as pre-existent, *in* which created things may exist. Gradually we see that there is no precedence and subsequence (between container and contained, vacuum and plenitude

of content), but that both are infinitely simultaneous. In the same fashion, that which we call the Samsāra, the World-process, in the sense of the unravellable complexity of infinite happenings and proceedings—that is only the measureless and countless stretch and expanse of details beyond the circumscribing line of our mental horizon, at which line our fatigued intelligence comes to a full stop, and takes rest, unable to go any further, for the time being.

The considerations in respect of time are exactly similar to those in respect of space. We first think: This that is existing now before us, it surely has limits in time. When was it born; how long will it stay; what was its condition before it assumed its present shape, etc? Then we think: Existence surely belongs to all time. And so the element of existence in all this that we see around us must also belong to all time. So too must the element of non-existence in them. And in this sense dissolution as well as emanation is incessant. Day, night, sleeping, waking, birth, death, love, hate, joy, sorrow—all are incessant and endless.

With this we come back to the statement that action arises in and out of actionlessness,[1]

---

[1] I have endeavored, in what follows, to reproduce as exactly as possible the peculiarity of the author's

change in changelessness. How is it possible? It is the very nature, the Sva-bhāva, of the Self. An omission (of special observation), by an individualised consciousness, of a part out of the Totality of parts which is the Whole, appears as the existent passing into the non-existent, and *vice versa.* I-This-Not is Brahman. Whatever is understood by this collocation of three words is Brahman. And it always has asṭiṭva, existence, 'is-ness'. Because of this existence, activity is unavoidable within it. Whatever *is*, inevitably *does* something also. Or if it does not itself directly do anything, then something becomes, occurs, takes birth *from* it, because existence must have a result; otherwise the existence would be null and nil, the same as if it were *not*. Nor, on the other hand, can pure non-existence be affirmed exclusively, and existence denied altogether. The multitudinous world is a fact not to be ignored. From its insistent pressure upon our senses we must infer that it is, and that there is same maker of it, some root and source of it. And, in this wise, from the obtrusive presence of elements of both existence and non-existence all about us in the

---

argument. The same conclusions are led up to, by what to some readers may be perhaps a somewhat easier phrasing and way of thinking, in chapters viii. and x. of *The Science of Peace*.

world, we further infer that the root and source of it must also contain both these elements. In other words, we argue on the one hand, that the nature or form, the sva-rūpa of all this that appears to us 'is-not' that of its root-source, because of the patent differences and transformations and passings into 'non-existence'. On the other hand, we argue that some root there must be, because it 'is' not a case of pure non-existence. This root, whatever it is, combining in itself existence and non-existence, being and non-being, is Brahman, best described and defined as I-This-Not. This description by three words is necessary because it is not possible to describe adequately by any one sound or word a thing that includes within itself two distinct factors. When regarded as a unity containing within itself all diversity, then the one word that describes Brahman is the AUM which is also a unity including all diversity. Corresponding to this sacred sound-word there are words in every language. Indeed, in a sense, all words whatsoever are but forms of the *Praṇava,* for each is a modification of that primal sound and each indicates one mood, one aspect, or another, of the Supreme Brahman; and truly the name of each atom is only a name for Brahman.

(When we apply the general theory of the initiation of action in actionlessness to a concrete case, a particular world-system, what do we see?) A jīva, having attained to the state of Mahā-Vishṇu, creates a samsāra. His ability to do so, however, depends on his finding vacant *space* wherein to do so. And, in yet another aspect, at the *time* he attains his Mahā-Vishṇu-ship, his action, his work as such, is yet non-existent, is latent still, is yet in the future. *In* this condition of actionlessness, he initiates action. We may see examples of this in daily life around us. A baby is born; following the laws of his own constitution he grows to man's estate and founds his business, a household, where there was none before. The one, the solitary, is married to another; whence many new relationships, and the birth and 'finding' of children. In exactly the same way does Mahā-Vishṇu 'find' Brahmā, Vishṇu, etc., and 'found' his business, his samsāra, in sheṣha-ḍesha,[1] remaining space, space which is not occupied by others. In this space and time he spreads out his ideation. The totality of his pra-sāraṇas, spreadings out, expansions, and pra-sāriṭas,

---

[1] In Purāṇic lore Sheṣha is the thousand-headed serpent on whose coils Mahā-Vishṇu sleeps during pralaya. The word sheṣha also means the 'remainder'.

the things spread out, is his s a m-s ā r a.

By great striving indeed has Mahā-Vishṇu, beginning as an atom, attained to his present estate, adding knowledge to knowledge, little by little. Whoever has attained to any condition obviously knows all about all preceding conditions. Hence Mahā-Vishṇu is omniscient of all that intervenes between the atom and himself. Having arrived at his present condition he 'feels' his actionlessness and so thinks of action. And this thought of his inspires (or is felt in, or is the same as the natural life-activity of) every atom.

And even as Mahā-Vishṇu has attained his present status, so is all and every one destined to do.

CHAPTER XXVI.

LIGHT AND SHADE.

The World-process in terms of Light and Darkness as corresponding to existence and non-existence.—Darkness the sheath of Light.—The triplet of luminous, lumen, illumined.—Light and Shade as Ḍaivī-prakṛṭi and Mūla-prakṛṭi.—Also as aparāṭmā and parāṭmā.—Their condition in pralaya, etc.—The Science and Art of picturing.—Three kinds thereof.—Painting; photography; precipitation.—Sub-divisions.—The psychology of memory as a picture-process.—Clairvoyance, etc.—Application to the Science and Art of Medicine.—Three grades of physicians.—Application to other sciences and arts.—Correspondence of the three kinds of 'picturing' with A, U and M.—Metaphysical significance of 'depiction.'

(The World-process generally having been described in the fore-going chapter in terms of existence and non-existence, we may endeavor now to describe a particular world-system in corresponding terms of light and darkness, as kriyā and praṭi-kriyā.) Let us regard Mahā-Vişhṇu, corresponding to the A of the Logion, as composed of light, prakāsha, arising within the empty darkness, ṭamas, that

brooded over itself before this world-system began, as the Scripture says. (We have to remember, all the while, of course, that this is only a convenient way of speaking; for, strictly) light and darkness are simultaneous and inseparable, of necessity. Darkness is only the upāḍhi, the sheath, of light, and is always pervaded by the latter. They are mutually āḍhāra and āḍheya, supporter and supported, substance and attribute. The Self is light; the This is darkness; that which is neither is the Not. Such is the interdependence of the two that one cannot be spoken of without implying the other. Corresponding with the Self, as just said, Mahā-Vishṇu is full of light. And darkness is also there. For without that which is lighted up, light itself would not be lighted up, not be thrown into relief, not become visible. No more, also, can light exist apart from the luminous, from that which possesses the light. The light-maker is always present everywhere in his light.[1] As the *Nyāya* says: The cause is always present in the effect. Thus,

---

[1] Wherever a ray of the sun strikes a true reflector there the whole of the sun may be seen. If the chiṭṭa-atom has been sufficiently purified and steadied and is not stained and vibrating with egoistic peculiarity and excitement, it will reflect omniscience and omnipotence and omnipresence.

it is true that there is no separateness between the luminous and the light. Still the distinction is also true. And we have the triplet of illuminator, illuminated and light. The first is Mahā-Viṣhṇu; the second is the amsha, portion, of Mahā-Viṣhṇu, of the nature of chhāyā,[1] shadow, picture, dwelling within light; the third is obvious.

---

[1] These sentences will probably throw much light, for many students, on the statements—as to the giving of their 'shadows' by various classes of Piṭṛs, for the evolution of human beings—made in theosophical literature. The fact stated is not anything peculiar and mysterious. In a sense, every act of procreation and multiplication is such a giving off of a 'shadow'. The basic laws of the World-process are few and simple; but they are always appearing in ever new and strange shapes and unfamiliar disguises. The synonymisation of amsha and chhāyā in the text is very helpful. The distinctions made in theosophical literature, in different ways, by different writers, are apt to be very perplexing, if such a metaphysical clue is not diligently carried in the hand of his mind by the student. Monad, Ego, Augoeides, individuality, personality, etc.; āṭmā, buḍḍhi, manas and āṭmic plane, buḍḍhic plane, and mental plane or ākāsha, vāyu and fire—all such are apt to puzzle the reader very much. He feels that he is being asked to readjust all his previous ideas and conclusions,

In the expression, 'portion of Mahā-Viṣhṇu,' Mahā-Viṣhṇu as the thread or s ū ṭ r a, is typical of the Universal Self. As every self is a portion of the Universal Self, so every particular j i v a

---

by every new writer he takes up—till he is inclined to throw away the whole as hopeless. His safety lies in getting firm hold of the ultimate *metaphysical principles.* With their help he can steer confidently through all the difficulties of endless physical (including superphysical and as opposed to metaphysical) *particulars.* An a m s h a of the Self in a piece of the Not-Self, and the piece of the Not-Self arranged in various layers, the inner ones masquerading as soul, and the outer ones as body—this is the principal fact to be borne in mind. In the next degree, descending one step into particulars, the classification of human *principles* as originally given through H. P. B. and Sinnett is most helpful—*principles* as distinguished from sheaths or *particular* bodies. In a certain sense, these seven *principles*, āṭma, buḍḍhi, manas (subdivided into three), kāma-prāṇa, and sṭhūla-sharīra, would be found in every living creature whatsoever. They are the *metaphysical* architectonic, the ground-plan, of the constitution of every creature, every 'living house'. In English, Āṭma is the Self; manas, an atom (let us say) of the Not-Self ; buḍḍhi is the force of reason and love playing between the two; this is one triplet. The other triplet, by inverse reflexion—caused by the necessity and law

may be regarded as a portion of its particular īshvara. Hence the saying: This jīva, being a portion of īshvara, when it attains mukṭi, attains to the condition of that īshvara and experiences supreme bliss. It is obvious, amsha or portion here does not mean something divided off in the ordinary sense. Such a division of the Self is not possible. The assuming of the sheaths of 'shadow' makes the division here.

In accordance with the law of universal activity, light enters into shadow, permeates and pervades it everywhere. In consequence of this, and because the 'possessors of light,' the luminous, are everywhere present in the light,

---

of aḍhyāsa—is; manas, mind, sṭhūla, material body, and kāma-prāṇa, vital force of sensation and desire, playing between the two. Manas, occurring twice, becomes a triplet itself; a face presented to the higher or inner; another face, presented to the outer; a something between, for it cannot be altogether broken up. Now this 'ground-plan' is repeated endlessly in all kinds and planes and layers of matter. In different cycles, spaces, times, conditions, *each principle* manifests principally in one *particular* kind of matter; as the same architectural plan may be materialised in bricks, or stone, or wood, or marble, etc.

pictures (of them) are formed in the darkness.[1] Some distinctions, involved in these considerations, should be dealt with here. So long as the two are considered separately, the one is called ṭ a m a s, darkness, and the other p r a k ā s h a, light. Again, that which is *in* the light, is 'seated in' it, is called p r a k ā s h y a, the 'to-be-illumined' (a piece of the darkness ?) and the possessor of light is called Mahā-Viṣhṇu. On the other hand, an a m s h a of light, a portion of Mahā-Viṣhṇu, exists *in*, is 'seated in,' darkness. (Self and Not-Self can only be defined by each other, the latter limiting the former, the former unlimiting the latter; and yet neither can really be defined in terms of the other, except by negation.) Thus, each appears *in* the other and develops a triplicity, etc.; but the appearance is ever false. The clear and complete exposition of ṭ a m a s can never be secured in precise detail, because of its extreme subtlety, and the impossibility of seeing in it, because of

[1] The text here is more than commonly peculiar. The reader will have to exercise an uncommonly alert intuition also, therefore, to elucidate these considerations of light and darkness. And yet it is all only a translation of the preceding chapter into terms of the slightly less abstract and more concrete. Those acquainted with the physics of light will probably be able to make something more definite out of this whole chapter.

its very nature of darkness. At the same time, because it cannot be hidden from Yoga-vision its content should also be dealt with. (If darkness were wholly impossible of elucidation, light would be useless too. Each is therefore 'partly' definable by the other, positively; but wholly, only by the negation of the other; the whole being the sum-total and therefore the abolition and the opposite of all parts). This content, that which is 'seated in' darkness, is known as parāṭmā in the world. Thus (*i.e.*, in the form of parāṭmā and aparāṭmā) then takes place conjunction between light and shade. Difference of condition makes difference of names (and of things). Otherwise, indeed, all being one, each name means everything. When light and shade are in 'proximity,' sāmīpaka, only, and not in conjunction, they are named otherwise. Then, light is Ḍaivī-prakṛṭi or shakṭi, *i.e.*, Energy; for energy is light, and according as the energy is in any object, such is its light (glow, blaze, radiance or, strictly, cognisability in terms of any sense). The corresponding name of darkness (incognisability) is Mūla-prakṛṭi. The conjunction-names, of amshas of the two respectively are aparāṭmā and parāṭmā.[1]

---

[1] The words parā and aparā seemed to be used here in the reverse way to that of the *Upaniṣhaṭ*

Parāṭmā, permeated with the quality of darkness, resides in Mūla-prakṛṭi. Aparāṭmā, enveloped with the quality of light, in Daivī-prakṛṭi. Of those that are sāmīpaka, close to each other, in juxtaposition, yoga or conjunction is necessary. Whatever is near to another, is of necessity in sambanḍha, in relation to, or is bound up with that other. Such relatedness is melana[1] meeting, mixture, connexion, attunement. Two things cannot meet and mix together unless and until there is some kind of relationship between them. Indeed, the mere existence of two (recognised together by one consciousness) carries the necessity of relationship between the two within itself. This necessity is a matter of Svabhāva. The relation itself, the nexus, the means which brings about the relating, is the third, *viz.*, the one common existence which embraces both, (the consciousness which cognises both). Along such lines of thought is it stated in the *Sāṅkhya* that whatever *appears*, bhāsaṭe,

---

verse which speaks of the 'lower knowledge' as aparā and the 'higher' as parā.

[1] The word occurs in some of the 'minor' *Upaniṣhaṭs* in connexion with individual and cosmic Kundālinī, the attunement of which is spoken of in *The Secret Doctrine*, Vol. III.

manifests forth, that is itself all m ū l a (in contrast with the current notion that M ū l a-p r a k-ṛ ṭ i is a deeper, or rather the deepest and ultimate, layer or plane of matter. For, from the standpoint of metaphysic, all layers are as one, all attributes in their totality make substance, nothing can manifest which is not in the very heart, every presentation is unique.)

Portions of A h a m and E ṭ a ṭ, light and shade, are always near together[1] even during the p a r i v a r ṭ a n a-p a k ṣ h a, the 'reverse or inverse side' (the n i v ṛ ṭ ṭ i-m ā r g a, the arc of re-ascent into spirit, the path of renunciation, or p r a l a y a itself) when the Negation prevails, and so prevailing (and therefore, to one view, tending then to separate the two) yet (to another view, as the nexus) holds them together. Thus do we see everywhere that an intensely luminous atom of A h a m does work, discharges functions and produces effects only in conjunction with an atom of E ṭ a ṭ and deep darkness. The World-process is all but a fabric woven of light and shade (when we are using terms of vision) intermixing and changing place, in m e l a-n a and v y ā v a r ṭ a n a.

Because of this, whenever there is p r a k ā-

---

[1] See Fournier's *Two New Worlds*, for theories as to the existence of supra-light or infra-light in that which to the normal man is deepest darkness.

s h a-p r a k ṣ h e p a, *i.e.*, whenever light is 'flung' into, radiated into ṭ a m a s, then and there is a picture formed of the luminous object. Because both elements are present in each a m s h a, the one attracts the other. Things that are similar, s a m ā n a, attract each other. Therefore when light combines with shade, then the picture is formed there (where the conjunction takes place) of the luminous object. So painters, c h i ṭ r a-k ā r a s, declare. The fact here is that light exists everywhere, and so does shade; and that when an object (radiating light) affects the p a-ḍ ā r ṭ h a, substance or material, 'residing' in the shade in such a manner that the latter catches or attracts and fixes the light from the luminous object, then the picture is formed of that luminous object.[1]

It is true that, apparently, even without light, *i.e.*, the luminous object, on the one side, and

[1] It should be noted that the word luminous in the text and context here does not mean 'shining' or radiating white light only, like the sun and fire—but all visible objects, which throw off any kind of light, white or colored, by radiation, diffusion or reflexion or in other known or unknown way. The mind of the reader of this work should, throughout, be turned more (not wholly) to the general principles and less to (but by no means wholly ignoring) the precise concrete details.

without the dark or shaded substance, on the other, pictures may be drawn by the hand on the surface of the ground, or on a sheet of gold or other substance, or may be formed in the mind. But even here, in reality, the underlying principle of intermixture of light and shade is the same. For only things that have been seen in some form or other can be so drawn, and that seeing is a matter of light and shade. Professional painters, for this very reason, are always observing minutely all kinds of objects in all sorts of places, with reference to their possibilities for paintings, and fix their lights in (the shades of) their memory, for future use. Because memory is a matter of cognition, which is a matter of the present, which is a matter of the universal, therefore things that have been once seen may be pictured by means of the memory. In the exercise of memory, a subtle, minute and luminous picture of the object concerned is formed in the mind.[1] Then a

[1] Theosophical literature elucidates such statements fully. As compared with bodily and obviously material facts, mental facts, thoughts, etc., are non-material, psychic. But because spirit and matter are inseparable, therefore these psychical thoughts also, from the point of view of a still deeper introspection, take place and shape in a far subtler kind of matter, mind-stuff, mental matter, agni-ṭaṭṭva technically,

'shadow' of it is projected 'near' or on the 'eye'. Then the picture is externally drawn by the hand, in 'darkness,' *i.e.*, on a non-luminous surface. Such is chiṭr-āvarodhana, the 'penning,' 'confining,' 'hemming in' fixing, painting of pictures.

Chiṭr-ākarṣhaṇa, on the other hand, the 'attracting' or 'drawing' of pictures, is brought about by placing the luminous object near the shaded. It is possible with regard to unseen or invisible objects also, by the definite picturing of them in the mind.

Finally, a person specially endowed with and possessed of the requisite power, faculty or outward instruments and means—*e.g.*, the power of clairvoyance, psychometric faculty, psychic sensitiveness, or mediumistic capacity; or specially prepared apparatus, discs of metal, guṭikās, crystals, stones of peculiar virtue, etc.—may touch some part or limb or organ of the object or person concerned, and thereupon 'draw' pictures relating to it or him. This is

---

matter of the mental plane. And this is repeated endlessly, (by parity of reasoning) as subtler and subtler layers of being open up in the jīva. As, in cognition, external objects are pictured first on the 'eye' (retina, etc.) and then in the mind; so, in 'action,' the process takes place, it would seem, in the reverse order, as said in the text.

known as chiṭra-sārī. In this process things contained in the suṣhumnā, maḍhyamā, sarpiṇī and other nerves are 'drawn'. There are two sub-divisions of this process also, avaroḍhana and ākarṣhaṇa.[1]

---

[1] In modern terms, these passages seem to describe (i) painting, (ii) some process corresponding to photography, (iii) some process corresponding to what is called 'precipitation' in theosophical literature, and (iv) some process allied to psychometric or clairvoyant seeing and description of things invisible to the eye of flesh. Avaroḍhana seems to cover (i) primarily and (iii) secondarily; and ākarṣhaṇa (ii) primarily and (iv) secondarily. Chiṭra-sārī properly includes (iii) and (iv), these two being sub-divisions corresponding, in the nature of their process, on a subtler plane, to (i) and (ii) on the denser plane. 'Precipitation' is, so to say, painting with mental hands. It is noticeable that the word ākarṣhaṇa means the same thing as 'drawing' in English and 'khīñchnā' in Hinḍī *i.e.*, attracting, pulling, dragging; and that they all apply to picture-drawing, though in English and Hinḍī the verb now indicates the manual process, while in Samskṛṭ it refers to a photographic process.

With reference to the statement about things 'contained in' the nerves, see the *Yoga-shikhā-Upaniṣhaṭ*, ch. vi., and other 'minor' *Upaniṣhaṭs*, where it is said that all the universe is present in the suṣhumnā, etc. It is the nāḍī which connects the finite with the Infinite. From one point of view,

Avarodhana, chiṭra-sārī, etc., may be observed and utilised in the practice of medicine also. Thus, the injunction of medical science is: let the physician examine the patient in one or all of three ways, (i) by sight, (ii) by touch, (iii) by examination of the messenger. The successful

---

and in other words, it may be said that this nāḍī (apparently corresponding to the spinal canal) is the locus, the main working-tract, of that finest and purest chiṭṭa-atom of a given jīva, which like a spotless mirror, reflects all the contents of the world-system to which that jīva belongs, because of consanguinity of nature between that chiṭṭa-atom and the Logos' mind. In theosophical phrase, the monad is omniscient on its own plane; and the greater the refinement and purification of the grosser sheaths brought about by ṭapas and yoga-processes, the larger the amount of omniscience that can shine through.

What has been said in the text in terms of light, will apply *mutatis mutandis*, to the other senses, in terms of sound, touch, etc. I have been informed by a sannyāsi-friend of mine that he once read in a work called the *Ṭanṭrāloka* (which I have not been able to see) that there were praṭibimbās, 'reflected pictures,' of all sense-objects, and not only of visible. The 'echo' belongs to sound the reflected image to light. Modern science has fixed these by the phonograph and the photograph. The others have to be discovered yet.

practice of the third is possible only to 'great physicians,' m a h ā-v a i ḍ y a s. They can draw accurate inferences, as to the case of the patient, from the facial expression and general appearance, and the tone of voice, of the messenger; also from their own inner feeling or condition, their own total general impression. Because of the law and fact that all exists everywhere, therefore a complete 'picture' of the patient's condition and of his surroundings may be 'seen' by the physician endowed with the necessary faculty, in and from the messenger's voice, face, etc.[1] S a ḍ-v a i ḍ y a s, good physicians,

---

[1] A generation ago, these statements would have appeared fanciful and baseless to the 'modern reader' of that time. To-day, hypnotic experiments, the established facts of psychometry, clairvoyance, clairaudience, 'internal autoscopy,' x-rays, n-rays, the wonders of radium, the performances of spiritistic mediums, the passing of solid matter through solid matter with instantaneous disintegration and re-integration, levitation, burial for days and weeks and subsequent revival, cataleptic trance for weeks with every mark of death and coming again to life, phantasms of the living, telepathy, and other 'wonders' have changed the opinion of the public from 'disbelief' towards that of open-minded study and search for more knowledge out of the endless and exhaustless store of Omniscience. And therefore the text is likely to be appreciated rather than slighted.

physicians of the next order of skill and endowments, examine by means of sight. K e v a l a-v a i ḍ y a s mere or ordinary physicians, of the third order, examine by means of touch, (feeling the pulse, the temperature, etc.) The effort to cure, it should be remembered, is always an *effort,* p r a y a ṭ n a, included within, forming part of, and governed by the All-destiny, the 'to be,' b h ā v y a.

A true physician, examines not only the physical condition of the patient, but also the condition of his l i ṅ g a, s ū k ṣ h m a and k ā r a ṇ a bodies in their relation to the physical. And all this is matter for the science and art of c h i ṭ r a-s ā r ī.

Other developments of that science and art make it possible to paint the picture of a person on hearing his voice only. Or, on seeing some one person only, to paint true pictures of his wife and his children. Or, if extreme skill has been attained, to paint the faithful portrait of a person, on only seeing a friend of his, or even only some article belonging to him.[1] Again,

[1] The reader will probably be reminded here of the rapid 'deductions' and 'inferences' of Conan Doyle's favorite hero, Sherlock Holmes, whose feats rivalled those of thought-readers and clairvoyants, and who always explained them as the result of accurate 'reasoning'. The text, shortly before, has also

new pictures may originate from old pictures. Briefly, there are many, indeed endless, develop-

---

spoken of great physicians drawing 'accurate inferences' from the face and voice of the messenger, and then mixed up or rather merged these inferences into clairvoyance, etc. Some people might incline to think that 'inference' is simpler to believe in than 'clairvoyance'. This is only the common delusion that the familiar is simple and intelligible. Really, nothing is more or less wonderful than anything else. There is nothing to choose between inference and clairvoyance on the score of simplicity. Indeed each involves the other. Psychologists know that apparently instantaneous perception involves long processes of reasoning, and *vice versa.* Our present instantaneously-acting sense-organs are the result of long and laborious processes of evolutionary exertion, which gradually modified touch (as modern evolutionists believe, and sound, as the ancients say) into the other senses (the ancients adding that the 'psychic' and 'causal aspect of the functions, ṭan-māṭras, etc., are pre-existent, and the 'organs' only successively formed). Even so, by processes of meditation, shravaṇa, manana, niḍiḍhyāsana, or ḍhāraṇā, ḍhyāna, samāḍhi, etc., our present mental faculties or material for common observation and reasoning will become re-formed, transformed, into new superphysical faculties and organs. 'Rapid reasoning,' etc., systematically improved, develops or crystallises the appurtenant mind-stuff—this is

ments of each science and art.[1] The underlying reason which makes all this possible is the series of affinities, sāmyaṭā, samānaṭā,

---

one way of putting it—into a regular organ of 'intuition;' in other words, vitalises, opens up the spirillæ of brain-centres, brain-cells, in such a fashion that they can become the vehicles of pre-existent and latent faculties. 'Rapid reasoning' here is to be taken not as exhaustive of the mental moods referred to, but as one (or one aspect) of them, 'Quieting the mind,' 'making it one-pointedly and intensely attentive, recipient, etc.,' is not opposed to, but one element in 'reasoning,' if the latter word is used in a comprehensive sense. The underlying principle, as the text says later, is the same.

[1] This sentence of the text itself throws light on the preceding text and continues the idea of the previous foot-note. A certain result can be brought about in very many apparently different ways. But on examination the ways will be found nowise to contradict each other. In an issue of the *Annals of Psychic Science* for 1908, a certain mediumistic phenomenon was discussed by a professional scientist under twenty-five different hypotheses, all of which he rejected as not appropriate and sufficient. And yet if he had looked at the case with knowledge of Theosophical literature, he would have seen that every one of the twenty-five ways had an actual existence and practical application in the super-physical world.

similarities, unities in diversities, connecting threads, which exist between all things and 'bring them together'.

Chiṭr-āvarodhana corresponds to A. Chiṭr-ākarṣhaṇa to U. The absence of both, achiṭra or vi-chiṭra (blankness or multichromy?) to M. Because of this bewildering, undefinable, knowledge-eluding, negative nature of the World-process is it always spoken of as vichiṭra, unpicturable or multi-pictured, marvellous, wonderful and variegated, parti-colored, multi-colored, kaleidoscopic.

This *Chiṭra-shāsṭra*, the Science of Depiction, has application in other sciences also besides that of Medicine, wherein it is useful for purposes of diagnosis, as we have just seen. In *Yoga*, it is useful for paribhāvana, cogitation, imaging, reflexion. In *Nyāya*, it helps the nirṇaya, the decision or conclusion, (bringing up definite pictures before the mind, of the possible alternatives). In the *Upa-shāsṭras*, collateral, subsidiary or derivative sciences, branches of science, it has its uses also. It is the all in all of lovers. One of the arts belonging to and arising out of the Science of Love is to 'draw,' *i.e.*, attract the object of love, the beloved, by concentration on a picture

formed through sound or sight. We may often notice that the voice alone of fine women or fine men arouses love. A picture of the whole being of the person travels along his or her voice to the person affected; for the voice, the appearance, the age, etc., of any person are co-ordinated with, in apposition or correspondence with each other, and each one may be inferred from any other. So, in *Jyotiṣha*, the astrologer instructed in this art, can find out the planets that influence any person, by merely hearing that person's voice, or seeing his appearance, or only his picture, and without being told the time of his birth, etc. Forms seen in dreams, etc., may also be painted (from memory, during the subsequent waking state), but they cannot be 'photographed,' ā k a r- ṣ h a ṇ a, because of lack of the needed material during the sleeping condition. That the experiences of one person in his subtler bodies, can be discovered by another person, is due to the fact that the latter also has similar bodies, and also because, in reality, another is not another (but all are one).

Detailed descriptions of the applications of this science and art in the various departments of life may be read in the *Iṭihāsas*, histories.

The metaphysical significance of it all is that

as a picture represents the original, even so does the whole mass of appearances of the World-process represent its Mūla, Root, Source.

Radiance, bloom and revelling,
Light and glow and joyousness,
Lotus-petal purity,
Delicate shade and shimmering sheen,
Limpid lakes and silky skies,
Velvet midnight silvered through
With the gleam of glowworm stars,
Interlacing light and dark,
Dancing, singing planets—hark!
All is I, yea, all is I!
